

Shri M. C. Shah: What I stated was small coins of the denomination of eight annas and less, if necessary, for the purpose of just removing the difficulties of the poorer classes for which the hon. Member is so anxious.

Shri V. G. Deshpande: So, it will be issued. That is what I am opposing.

Dr. Suresh Chandra (Aurangabad): This is just wasting time of the House. All this has been discussed yesterday.

Shri V. G. Deshpande: I protest against this remark.

Swami Ramananda Tirtha (Gulberga), rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If the hon. Member had not been interrupted he would have finished by this time.

Shri V. G. Deshpande: What I want to observe is that the Government of Hyderabad should not be allowed to issue any more new coins, even of smaller denominations on the plea that the poorer classes would be benefited. I want that the 'Char Minar' should go away completely.

Dr. Jaisoorya (Medak): If I have heard the hon. Deputy Finance Minister rightly, he said by this step they are taking over all the assets and liabilities. Am I to assume, therefore, that the Government of India will take up the responsibility for the Government promissory notes that the Government of Hyderabad have issued up till now.

3 P.M.

Shri M. C. Shah: That question does not arise. The question is about currency and coinage and the reserves for their backing. And we have taken all those assets and liabilities as far as currency and coinage are concerned. That is what I have stated very clearly.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will proceed with the further discussion of the Demands for Grants relating to the Ministry of Home Affairs and the Ministry of States. **Shri R. D. Misra** was in possession of the House.

श्री आर० डी० मिश्र (जिला बुलन्द-शहर) : माननीय अर्थक्षेत्र जी, कल मैं यह कह रहा था कि मैं अपने होम मिनिस्टर को मुबारकबाद देता हूँ कि उन्होंने देश में शान्ति और व्यवस्था को बनाये रखा। जिस वक्त यह देश आजाद हुआ उस वक्त इस देश में अशान्ति फैली हुई थी और इस देश के आदमी खूँखार बन चुके थे और एक दूसर की जान के गाहक बने हुए थे, ऐसे नाजुक समय में इस मिनिस्टर ने उम्दगी से काम किया और आज उसी का यह नतीजा है कि आज देश के अन्दर हम शान्ति देखते हैं और जो हमारी हुकुमत डगमगाती और बदलती हुई दिखाई देती थी, वह अब मजबूत हो गयी है। हम यह भी जानते हैं कि भारत के आजाद होने के बाद देश में जो हम प्रजातंत्र कायम करना चाहते हैं, उसके विरुद्ध बहुत सी ताकतें इस प्रयत्न में लगी हुई हैं कि यहाँ पर इस देश में प्रजातंत्र कायम न हो और उन्होंने मुस्तलिफ़ शकलें अख्तियार कर ली हैं और मुस्तलिफ़ पार्टियाँ कायम कर दी हैं, वह यह नहीं समझते कि आज देश में प्रजातंत्र संविधान बन जान से देश में प्रजातंत्र राज्य स्थापित हो गया है, हमें इस देश के एक २ नागरिक को प्रजातंत्र का सिद्धान्त सिखलाना है, उन्हें प्रेम का सबक देना है ताकि हम सब आपस में मिलकर ऐसे सुसंगठित हो जायँ ताकि हमारा यह देश बलवान और शक्तिशाली हो। जब कि हम इस काम में लगे हुए हैं, उस वक्त हमारे देश की कुछ शक्तियाँ इस काम में बाधक बन रही हैं और इस हाउस में जहाँ हम आकर बैठे हुए हैं हम हेखते हैं कि रोजमर्रा मुखालफ को बहुत काफ़ी मौका मिलता है और वह काफी बहस करते हैं और दलीलें देते हैं जब प्रेसीडेंट एड्रेस (address) आता है तब भी वही एक राग अलापा जाता है, बजट पेश होता है तो तब भी वही राग अलापा जाता है।

[श्री आर० डी० मिश्र]

एक बात एक दफा हो चुकी उसको खत्म करो, अब तो हमारे यहां प्रजातंत्र राज्य स्थापित है और इस प्रजातंत्र सरकार के सामने तमाम बातें मौजूद हैं लेकिन कोई स्थल नहीं किया जाता और काफी बातचीत और बहस इस बात पर होती है और हम यहां तक देखते हैं कि हमारे अखबार वाले इस पार्लियामेंट की क्या कीमत लगाते हैं मेरे सामने यह पैम्फलेट है जिसमें आप देखेंगे कि इस पार्लियामेंट का नाम टाकेटिव पार्लियामेंट रक्खा गया है और इस परचे को शायद करने वाले हैं फिल्म इंडिया के एडीटर बाबूराव पटेल जो इस देश के अन्दर प्रजातंत्र को कामयाब होता देखना नहीं चाहते । रोझमर्रा इस क्रिस्म की नई २ बातें फ्रिम्हंडिया में छापते हैं, मालूम ऐसा पड़ता है मानों इन्हीं को सारी आजादी मिली हो और इनके अलावा जितने आदमी इस देश में बसते हैं वह सब बेवकूफ बसते हैं । आज यह फ्रिम्हंडिया में रूसी २ चीजें छाप २ कर और पैम्फलेट निकाल कर नफरत का इजहार करें और परचे निकाल कर पार्लियामेंट के हर एक मेम्बर के पास भेजते हैं और एक २ क्रो दिखाते हैं कि मैं इस आजादी का इस तरह फायदा उठा रहा हूँ और इस तरह फुल्स पैराडाइस के द्वारा यहां के प्रेस वाले आजादी का नाजायज फायदा उठा रहे हैं और प्रेस वाले यहां के लोगों में प्रेम का सबक सिखाने के लिए नफरत फैलाते हैं । अगर हम अपने देश की उत्पत्ति बढ़ाने के लिए और बिजली का उत्पादन करने के लिए बांध बनाते हैं या बांध की स्कीम सोचते हैं तो वे हमारे भाई उसमें से छोटी २ बातें निकाल कर यह बतलाना चाहते हैं कि यह तमाम काम बेकार है, अगर हम तालीम बढ़ाना चाहते हैं तो कहते हैं कि तालीम बेकार है । अगर हम जमींदारी को खत्म करते हैं तो वह यह कहने लगते हैं कि यह काम बेकार है और अगर

हम राजाओं को खत्म करते हैं तो उसके लिए भी इनकी ओर से कह दिया जाता है कि यह बेकार काम है, गरजे कि कोई भी काम हम जनता की बहुवृद्धी का करें यह उसको बेकार कहते हैं, आप भी तो कोई काम हमें करने को कहें और हमें बतलायें कि अखिर आप चाहते क्या हैं । इस हाउस में बैठकर हम देखते हैं कि हमारे वह कम्युनिस्ट भाई जो हमारे साथ काम करने वाले थे और जो महात्मा गांधी के जमाने में पैदा हुए, उनमें बड़े काबिल लोग हैं, बी० ए०, एम० ए० और डाक्टर और वकील आदि हैं, फिर समझ में नहीं आती कि इतने पढ़े लिखे होने के बाद क्या यह डेमोक्रेसी नहीं समझते या पार्टी गवर्नमेंट नहीं समझते और क्या यह देश हित नहीं समझते यह तो सिर्फ यह ही समझते प्रतीत होते हैं कि आकर यहां हुकुमत की मुखालफत करो, मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ अपने कम्युनिस्ट भाईयों से कि अखिर आप क्या चाहते हो ? अरे राजा लोग तो हमने खत्म कर दिये, अब इस देश में कोई राजा नहीं है । आज इसी आपकी पार्लियामेंट के अन्दर वह राजे महाराजे जो किसी जमाने में राजा थे, आज एक कीमनमन की हैसियत से हमारे साथ इन बेंचों पर बैठे हुए हैं । कांग्रेस ने यह काम करके दिखाया, क्या इन्हीं कम्युनिस्ट बेंचों पर बैठे हुए राजाओं में से कोई भी कांग्रेस पार्टी में आकर शामिल हुआ है, वह लोग तो कम्युनिस्टों के साथ बोट करते हैं और उनके साथ मिलते हैं । दूसरी तरफ देखिये बड़े २ जमींदार हैं जिनको हमने खत्म किया हमें कोई राजाओं व जमींदारों से दुश्मनी नहीं थी, हमें तो एक मुआहिदे के जरिए उनको खत्म करना चाहते थे, हम उन राजा और जमींदार लोगों को मुआविजा देते हैं और कहते हैं कि भाई जैसे हम रहते हैं वैसे ही तुम लोग भी इस देश में रहो, तुम भी इस देश के नागरिक हो और हमारा तुम्हारा सबका फ्रज है कि मिल कर देश की

तरक्की करें। लेकिन जमींदार हमसे नाराज हैं और इनके साथ शामिल हैं जिनकी और से यह नारा लगाया जा रहा है कि घेला मत दो और आज आप उनके साथ शामिल हैं जो यह कहते हैं कि गोली मार देनी चाहिये, चीन की बड़ी तारीफ करते हैं, उस चीन में मालूम है कि जमींदारों का क्या हथ्र हो रहा है ? वहां चीन में जमींदारों की हालत अच्छी तो से भी गयी बीती है, वहां पर जमींदारों को कोई वोट का राईट नहीं, वहां बड़े २ मालदारों को वोट का राईट नहीं है और मजे की बात यह है कि आज बड़े २ राजा और जमींदार और पूंजीपति वगैरह उन कम्युनिस्ट भाइयों के साथ बैठे हुए हैं, भले ही आप उनके साथ कांग्रेस के खिलाफ वोट दे लो, लेकिन याद रखो कि अगर तुम्हारी बदकिस्मती से, मेरी से नहीं, अगर तुम्हारी बदकिस्मती से इस देश में कम्युनिस्ट राज्य हुआ तो सबसे पहले पेंड के तने में तुम्हीं लोगों को लटकाया जायगा और सबसे पहले तुम्हें ही गोलियां मारी जायगीं। यह हमारे होम मिनिस्टर साहब की बदीलत है कि आपको वोट का हक मिल गया और उसका अहसान न मानकर आज आप हमारे कांग्रेस के खिलाफ मुक़ाबले में बैठकर वोट देते हैं। पुराने जमाने में जब कांग्रेस होती थी तो जैसा कल हमारे स्टेट के भाई रामानन्द तीर्थ कह रहे थे कि वहां यह कहा जाता था कि हमें भी कांग्रेस में शामिल कर लो, कांग्रेस का मेम्बर बना लो, और हम भी समझते थे कि कांग्रेस में अगर यह स्टेटस् वाले आजायेंगे तो हमारी शक्ति बढ़ जायगी। उस पर हमारे लीडर पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू; मोलाना आज़ाद आदि बड़े २ लोगों ने बतलाया कि नहीं भाई इन्हें नहीं लेना चाहिये तो उस समय हमारी समझ में नहीं आया कि यह हमारे नेता स्टेट के लोगों को क्यों कांग्रेस में शामिल नहीं करना चाहते हैं। इस विषय पर मैंने उनसे अकेले

में बातचीत की और पूछा कि आखिर यह सलाह किस कारण से दी गई, इससे तो हमारी ताकत खत्म हो जायगी, तो उन्होंने हमें समझाया कि हम इन स्टेटस् को इसलिये नहीं शामिल करते हैं कि स्टेटस् के ये राजा अपनी स्टेटस् के अन्दर जुल्म करेंगे और अंग्रेज दुनिया में प्रोपेगन्डा करेंगे कि देख लजिये हिन्दुस्तान के राजा लोग अपने यहां की स्टेटस् कांग्रेस पर जुल्म कर रहे हैं और हम तो अपने यहां पर अच्छा बर्ताव कर रहे हैं और इसका नतीजा यह होगा कि देश के अन्दर लोगों में इन राजाओं के खिलाफ नफरत फैलेगी, इसलिए हम इनको शामिल नहीं करना चाहते।

दूसरी वजह यह है कि राजा लोगों में कोई शक्ति तो है नहीं और यह बही लोग है जिनके अन्दर का खून पीला पड़ चुका था। आपने अगर जुगराफिया पढा होगा तो देखा होगा कि अंग्रेज ने जितना इलाका फतह किया था उस पर लाल रंग था जिसका मतलब यह था कि अंग्रेज ने तलवार के जोर से हिन्दुस्तान फतह किया लाल रंग से मतलब खूनी जमीन का है और जहां पर यह देशी रियासतें थीं, वहां पर रियासतों का पीला रंग था, मतलब यह कि उनका खून पीला पड़ चुका था, उन राजाओं में कोई दम नहीं रह गया था...

श्री जी० एस० सिंह (भरतपुर - सवाई माधोपुर) : अस्वाड़े में आ जाइये।

श्री आर० डी० मिश्र : आप पुराने जमाने में ऐसा कह सकते थे, आज आपकी वह हालत नहीं है।

मैं हाउस में यह निवेदन कर रहा हूँ कि यह राजे लोग वही हैं जिन का रंग पीला पड़ चुका था। मेरे दोस्त शायद भरतपुर राज्य से आये हैं। उन को पता नहीं कि भरतपुर को अंग्रेजों ने कस फतह किया था। वहां की

[श्री आर० बी० मिश्र]

वजारत ने तोपों में बाजरा भर दिया था। ऐसे लोग भरतपुर के रहने वाले हैं जिन्होंने इस तरह से अंग्रेजों का मुकाबला किया था लेकिन वह क्या करें। उन का रंग पीला पड़ चुका था। हमसे कहा गया था कि जिस दिन हिन्दुस्तान आजाद होगा और अंग्रेज यहां से जायेंगे उसी दिन यह चुपचाप चले आयेंगे क्योंकि उन में हिम्मत नहीं। और आप ने देखा, हमारे सरदार पटेल, मरहूम, ईश्वर उन की रूह को शान्ति दे, उन्होंने राजे लोगों को कैसे चूटकियों में खत्म कर दिया। आज राजे हिन्दुस्तान में नहीं हैं, लेकिन आवाज उठाई जाती है कि पैसा मत दो, यह करो, वह करो, लेकिन हम अहिंसात्मक तरीके से हिन्दुस्तान में हुकूमत करना चाहते हैं, हम मुल्क के अन्दर बराबरी कायम करना चाहते हैं, राजे लोग हमारे दुश्मन नहीं हैं, वह इस जमीन में पैदा हुए हैं, जमींदार हमारे दुश्मन नहीं, वह हमारे भाई हैं, सब हमारे भाई हैं, हम उन को प्रेम से इस देश के अन्दर रखना चाहते हैं, मिल कर रहिये, बराबरी के साथ रहिये तुम्हें पूरा अधिकार ह चाहे यहां के राष्ट्रपति बनी, प्राइम मिनिस्टर बनी, मिनिस्टर बनी, जो मन में आये बनी, लेकिन शान्त रहते हुए, देश की सेवा करते हुए, लेकिन अगर देश की सेवा न कर के देश के साथ गहारी की तो मैं होम मिनिस्टर साहब से कहना चाहता हूं कि हुजूर अनवर, यह आप की ड्यूटी है कि आप यह देखें कि इस देश के अन्दर व ताकतें जो देश की डिमाक्रेसी को खत्म क देना चाहती हैं वह नाकामयाब रहें। आप पर बड़ी भारी जिम्मेदारी है। एक जिम्मेदारी डिफेंस मिनिस्टर पर है कि वह अपनी फौजों को तैयार रखें, अगर कोई गैर मुल्क हमारे देश को बुरी नीयत से देखे तो उस के मुकाबले के लिये देश के लोगों को तैयार करे कि यहां का क एक बच्चा देश के लिये कुरबान हो जाय।

लेकिन इसी के साथ साथ आप के ऊपर यह जिम्मेदारी है कि आप देखें कि इस मुल्क के एक एक बच्चे में देशभक्ति हो, डिमाक्रेसी के लिये प्रेम हो, और वह सच्चे उसूलों के लिये मरने को तैयार हों। और जो विनाशकारी शक्तियां खड़ी हों वह खत्म हो जायें और जल्द से जल्द खत्म हो जायें। मैं कह रहा हूं कि जन संघ है, राम राज्य परिषद् है, हिन्दू महासभा है, क्या किया है इन लोगों ने? उन्होंने धर्म के नाम पर बीड़ा उठाया है, अरे भाई, धर्म का नाम लेते हो और इन कम्युनिस्टों के पास बैठे हो, जो धर्म से वास्ता नहीं रखते, उन को ईश्वर का पता नहीं, जिन का मन्दिर से वास्ता नहीं, जिन को ठाकुर जी का पता नहीं उनके साथ बैठ कर बोट देते हो? तुम्हारे साथ उन का क्या रिश्ता क्या ताल्लुक? कहते हैं पुरानी संस्कृति। पुरानी संस्कृति का नाम लेते हैं और अंगरेजी में तकरीर करते हैं, संस्कृत भी नहीं जानते संस्कृति भी नहीं जानते। राम राज्य परिषद् का नाम लेते हैं। रमारज्य क्या है? राम राज्य तो त्रेता युग की बात है, जब सतयुग खत्म हो गया तो इस देश के अन्दर ऐसा जमाना आया जब कि विनाशकारी शक्तियों ने अपना कार्य संचालन आरम्भ किया था, उस जमाने में राम राज्य आया था। उस राम राज्य में क्या बात हुई। आप राम राज्य की बातें करते हैं, पहले शास्त्रों को पढ़िये तो सही। वह लोग समझते हैं कि चूंकि हमारा नाम रामराज्य परिषद् में है इस लिये हम हिन्दू हैं चूंकि हमारा नाम हिन्दू महा सभा में है इसलिये हम हिन्दू हैं और चूंकि मैं कांग्रेस में हूं इस लिये मैं हिन्दू ही नहीं। आप समझ लीजिये कि हम भी हिन्दू और आप भी हिन्दू। लेकिन हिन्दुत्व की बुनियाद क्या है? पढ़ा है

आप ने शास्त्र ? जो गुलामी की बुरी बातें इस देश में फैल गई थीं उन को फिर से लाना चाहते हैं। कहीं पर मनुस्मृति का नाम लेते हैं। क्या मतलब है स्मृति का ? इस का मतलब है पुरानी याद। सतयुग की जो बातें हम भूल गये उनको त्रेता में याद करके मनुस्मृति में संग्रह किया गया। क्या त्रेता के छमाने की याद रह गई उन चीजों को लायेंगे ? आप उसी में लटके हुए हैं ? आप का एक एक शास्त्र वेद पर कायम है। वेद मौलिक ग्रन्थ हैं, और मनुस्मृति के अन्दर लिखा हुआ है कि जो भी बात वेद के विरुद्ध है वह मानने के काबिल नहीं। क्या आप ने कभी यह जानने की कोशिश की कि वेद में क्या लिखा हुआ है, वेद का मतलब क्या है ? आप ने कभी कोशिश नहीं की उस को जानने की। आप तो समझते हैं कि चूँकि स्मृति में लिखा हुआ है कि हिन्दुस्तान में राजा होना चाहिये इस लिये राजा बनाना आप का धर्म है। लेकिन इस देश के अन्दर हमेशा से रहा है प्रजातंत्र। और इस देश के प्रजातंत्र की पहली बुनियाद यह थी कि गांव गांव में पंचायतें हों। अंगरेजों ने आकर इन पंचायतों को खत्म किया। इस देश के अन्दर सतयुग के जमाने से प्रजातंत्र था . .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If the hon. Member looks at me he will follow me. He has taken more than 15 minutes. He will conclude now.

श्री आर० डी० मिश्र : अगर आप गौर से देखें तो आप को पता लगेगा कि जो हमारा राष्ट्रीय संविधान है वह वेदों के ऊपर कायम है। आप को भी मंत्र दिये देता हूँ, अर्थ करने का समय नहीं लेकिन मैं एक बात आप को बता देना चाहता हूँ कि अगर आप दो तीन मंत्रों पर गौर करें तो आप को पता लगेगा कि हमारा देश वैदिक नीति के ऊपर चल रहा है, वैदिक सिद्धान्तों पर चल रहा है। अगर आप को

मौका लगे तो आप मुझ से आकर पूछ लें, या और किसी और मौके पर बताऊंगा। इस समय एक मंत्र आप के सामने रखता हूँ ताकि आप को भालूम हो जाय कि हमारे वेदों में क्या है। 'ओ३म्। संसमिद्युक्से वृषन्नग्ने विश्वान्यर्यं आ। इलस्पदे समिद्धसे स नो वसून्वा भर।

एक माननीय सदस्य : तो यह सकुलर स्टेट कैसे हो गई ?

श्री आर० डी० मिश्र : सेकुलर भी बताऊंगा आप को कि वेद कैसे सेकुलर था। वेद के जमाने में कोई मजहब नहीं था। वह तो एक युनिवर्सल ला है, किसी खास मजहब का नहीं है, वह तो ह्यूमैनिटी का ला है। आप तो शायद हिन्दू धर्म का पट्टा ले कर बैठ गये हैं। मैं आप को बताता हूँ। वह उस धर्म की बुनियाद पर नहीं बना है जिस से कि पाकिस्तान बन गया। वह सब से पुराना ग्रंथ मानव जाति का है। जो मंत्र मैं बताने जा रहा हूँ वह ऋग्वेद का है। वह ऋग्वेद के दसवें मंडल के १९१ वें सूत्र का पहला मंत्र है। पहले 'स' का मतलब है ईश्वरैलिटि दूसरे 'स' के माने हैं यूनैटी, एकता, 'इत्' के माने हैं यह, 'युवसे' के माने हैं यूनियन, वा गण-राज्य, 'वृषन्न' के माने हैं आश्वासन देना या प्रदान करना, 'अग्नि' के माने हैं कान्स्टिट्यूशन, 'विश्वानि' के माने हैं सब, 'अर्य' के माने हैं भारतवर्ष देश के रहने वाले, 'आ' के माने हैं यह, 'इलस्पदे' के माने हैं सेकुलर मामलात में, 'समिद्धसे' के माने हैं समान रूप से आत्म विकास करने के लिये, 'स' के माने हैं सहित, 'न' के माने हैं हम, 'वसूनि' के माने हैं राइट्स आफ सिटिजेनशिप, 'आ भर' के माने हैं ऐंडाष्ट करते हैं।

मैं अंग्रेजी में भी इस को ट्रान्स्लेट करना चाहता हूँ।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order please. The hon. Member must conclude. Nothing more.

The Deputy Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Datar): Yesterday, in the course of the debate, frequent references were made and the Home Ministry was criticised on a number of grounds. One was that the administration was not honest and that there was no sufficient integrity on the part of the public services. Then it was contended that the old Civil Servants who had been brought up in an atmosphere of autocracy have not sufficiently adjusted themselves to the democratic set-up. The third objection that was raised was that corruption was rampant in all the classes of services and for this purpose a reference was made to the Five Year Plan. The Five Year Plan deals with administration and lays down certain important principles that have to be implemented by the Government provided that the administration will carry out what it is intended to carry out. You will find from the Chapter on "Administration" that three factors have to be taken into account. One is the political leadership, the other is the public services and the third is the people in general. Now, so far as these three factors are concerned, unless all these three factors join together in mutual co-operation, it will not be possible to have a prosperous and successful administration. So far as political leadership is concerned, they form the Government and they lay down the policy. So far as the services are concerned, it is their duty to implement the policy as it is laid down by the Government of the time. It is not open to the public services to enter into any political questions; nor is it open to them to criticise the Government so long as they are members of the Government. So far as the public is concerned, it is the duty of the public to criticise to a reasonable extent, but, while criticising, it is also their duty to be appreciative. All these factors have been laid down.

Yesterday, unfortunately, a Member from this side, quoted one sentence from the Five Year Plan to the effect that there has been or that there has set in a lot of inefficiency so far as the present administration was concerned. I should like to point out to that hon. Member that that self-same report makes it very clear that at present after the advent of power, on account of a number of circumstances, we have become over-critical. While formerly under the British administration, we were working under a sense

of self-suppression, after the advent of power, we are going to the other extreme. We are not only over-critical, but are also hostile, whereas what was required on our part was a sense of appreciation. Therefore, if you require an administration that is entirely efficient, these are the various requirements that have to be fulfilled.

[**MR. SPEAKER** in the Chair]

So far as the public services are concerned, especially in India where we have a permanent service,—we have no officers who go out whenever there is a change in the Government; here the officers from top to bottom are permanent—it is their duty that they ought to keep aloof from politics, from all controversial matters. It is their duty to carry out the policy of the Government for the time being in office. For that purpose a certain measure of loyalty is expected. If it is found that there are certain parties or certain vested interests who try to tamper with this loyalty, then, every effort would be made by the Government in power to enforce the strictest loyalty so far as the public services are concerned.

Yesterday, we heard two voices so far as public services were concerned. At one time it was contended by the Opposition that the conditions of service of these public services were not good at all, that they had no sense of security. On the other hand, it was also contended with a show of so-called sympathy, because real sympathy there was none, that their salaries especially the salaries of the topmost officers were extravagant....

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair (Quilon *cum* Mavelikkara): No sympathy with them.

Shri Datar:and secondly, it was also stated that so far as these persons were concerned, they were subjected to arbitrary reversions and retrenchment. In this connection, if we want our public services to be what they are, we have to give them three conditions. One condition is that we must save them from carping criticism. Now, so far as these services are concerned, they are not here. It is open to the Opposition to criticise to their hearts' content, to the fullest measure so far as parliamentary decorum will allow, the policies of the Government and also the actions of the Government through the public services. But, actually, when the names of public servants are given on the floor of the House, then, these public servants have no opportunity

of defending themselves. Therefore what is required as an elementary principle of justice or fair play is that, as the hon. Speaker pointed out yesterday, if there are any instances,—there might be some—where a public servant is guilty of misconduct, such instances ought to be brought to the notice of the Government concerned. The Government will not be slow in enquiring into the matter and if it is found that the misconduct has been proved, naturally the strongest action would be taken and he would be subjected to the greatest penalty. While we have this object in view, as I have said, the first duty is to save the public servants from carping criticism. The second point is that they have to be trusted so long as they are in office subject to the stern requirement that they carry out the policy of the Government. Thirdly, you should give them a sense of security. So far as the sense of security is concerned, I would point out one or two circumstances. In 1950, the Constitution came into force. Before that, we had a class of highest service to which certain salaries and emoluments were given, which certainly were not what they ought to have been. In 1946, the former Government of India took into account the fact that these salaries were beyond all proportion and therefore appointed a Committee to go into the question. That Committee recommended that the salaries of the topmost officers should be reduced by at least 25 per cent. All those recommendations have been accepted by the Government which came into power after Independence. You will also find that we have given certain guarantees to what were known formerly as the covenanted services. These guarantees were given by the late Sardar Patel. They have also been embodied in the Constitution. Under these circumstances, so long as the Constitution remains what it is, so long as these guarantees are there, the question arises whether in time and out of time, it is open to the Members of this House and the public at large to go on always harping on the question that some officers are getting more than what they should. My submission is,—you will find that their number is small, is not much—that we will have to stick to these guarantees. Unless the Constitution itself is amended and the guarantees taken away, they will have to be given whatever has been agreed to be given as salaries, etc.

The next question that I should like to deal with is the important question of the rampant nature of corruption.

These allegations, or rather wild allegations of corruptions have been made here inside the Parliament as also outside the Parliament. With due deference to the hon. Member from Bilaspur, Madhya Pradesh, I was not prepared to hear the wildest and almost sweeping allegations that be made about the services in general. It is always the duty of the Members to inform the Government, and the pleasure and privilege of the Government to enquire into all these allegations, and if these allegations are proved, to take the strongest action against them. In fact, in this connection, I would invite the attention of the House, to one important circumstance. The Government of India have what is known as the Delhi Special Police Establishment. This establishment costs India Rs. 20 lakhs a year. This establishment has been brought into existence solely for the purpose of rooting out corruption. You will also agree, Sir, that corruption, black-marketing, all these evils are the contributions of war to the post-war period. The worst form of human depravity has come out, worst passions and worst avarice are now seen. Therefore, it is true that all the world over,—this is not confined only to India—there are many cases of corruption. Whenever there are such cases, then, it is the duty of every Indian, it is the duty of all Members of Parliament on this side or that to give us the advantage of their information. It will be our duty to sift that information and then to find out what is there. I would point out that the Commission has been dealing very rigorously and strictly so far as rooting out of corruption is concerned. I may also give here for your information certain figures which show to what extent Government have been acting without any mercy so far as such wrongdoers are concerned. During the last two years 1951 and 1952, we had a number of cases against different classes of officers. Now, oftentimes, the contention is made that we always catch the smaller fry and leave aside the bigger fish. That is not the case at all here.

Shri Jaipal Singh (Ranchi West—Reserved—Sch. Tribes): How many big fish have been caught?

Shri Datar: That is what I am reading.

Mr. Speaker: Let him proceed.

Shri Datar: If the hon. Members will allow me to give certain figures, then they would show how Government have been dealing with all the classes of Government servants, from

[Shri Datar]

top to bottom, from the I.C.S. at the top to the lowest postman in the different parts of the country. You will find that during these two years we have as many as 45 cases registered against gazetted officers. Now, these gazetted officers are of various grades, and against them 45 cases have been registered. Against commissioned Officers in the Army, we have registered cases, and their number is 13; and those who are non-gazetted or who are non-commissioned, their number comes to about 463. And every year this Department has been carrying on very rigorously the work of rooting out corruption. Cases are registered and then it is found that under the present Code of Criminal Procedure which has got a certain technical side, it is difficult for us often to prove an offence, because the technicalities of the law have to be complied with.

Shri Bhagwat Jha (Purnea *cum* Santal Parganas): Why do you not amend that?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Let there be no talk between Members. The hon. Minister need not take notice of it. He may proceed.

Shri Datar: I am coming to every point.

So far as these cases are concerned, whenever it is found that we have got sufficient legal evidence according to the requirements of the laws of evidence and criminal procedure, then sanction is given and the officers are prosecuted. Where it is found that the case for prosecution may not be so strong, then we have got also what is known as the Public Servants Conduct Act under which there is a semi-judicial enquiry, and that enquiry gives us the benefit of knowing the views of one of the highest judicial officers of the land. One enquiry is at present going on. It is going on even today. It is a public enquiry, and when that enquiry comes to an end, we shall have the report or the findings of the judicial officer on which we can act.

Then we have also what is known as the Departmental Enquiry, and in the case of a Departmental Enquiry, we have laid down a summary but fairly satisfactory procedure according to which.....

Mr. Speaker: Two minutes more.

Shri Datar:.....We follow the principle of law that even the devil has to be given its due. Now, in some cases, there may not be devils at all. So, the principle is that we give them

an opportunity to explain their conduct, and in case it is found that they are guilty under disciplinary jurisdiction, then action is taken either by way of dismissal or by way of reduction. So, these are the various steps that are being taken by Government to root out corruption.

Now, for rooting out corruption, one of the important points that we require is public co-operation, and public co-operation is often lacking. In fact, we have a temptation for getting things easily done by giving easy money. We are not in a mood to be strict or to be stern, but, ultimately, the character of the nation has to be developed, and if it is developed, then corruption will be a matter of the past.

Then, the next question I would deal with is the one that was raised by the Opposition. They stated that the number of officers or Government servants who were only temporary was larger than the number of those who were permanent. So far as this is concerned I would refer to certain figures which have been collected just now. They would show that the hon. Members' information was entirely incorrect. We have got here the figures. So far as the permanent employees are concerned, as in June, 1948, they were 6,97,000—i.e., about seven lakhs, and there were seven lakhs who were temporary. You will find it was immediately after the war was over. So, the number of those who were temporary and those who were permanent were almost equal. You will find after two years, i.e., in June, 1951, the permanent employees are eleven lakhs and the temporary employees are only five lakhs. So far as these temporary employees are concerned, you have also to take account of another very important factor, viz., that the Government of the day is not a Government which has merely to carry on the administration, maintain law and order and collect revenues, but it is and it purports to be a welfare State, and in order to carry on various welfare activities, the Government have to employ a very large number of persons. During the war also, we had to employ a very large number of persons, and you are aware, Sir, that on account of controls, on account of permits, on account of the prosecution of the war effort, a very large number of persons had to be taken in. And there are certain departments which it is not open for us to say whether they are going to be permanent or whether they are going to be temporary. A

number of departments even now are there. Take for example, the Ministry of Rehabilitation. Now, that Ministry is doing very important work, but a time has to come when the Ministry of Rehabilitation also will have to be wound up because the work of rehabilitation cannot be carried on indefinitely. But it is not possible for us to know at this stage as to when and whether it will be removed. So far as controls are concerned, there also the condition is equally the same. It is quite likely that economic controls in some form might remain here, but for this purpose, it is not open for Government to understand the extent of the servants who have to be kept permanent and the extent of servants who can be made temporary.

The moment war came to an end, Government found that some retrenchment had to be carried out, and side by side, some confirmations had also to be made. So, Government immediately confirmed 50 per cent. of the temporary servants. That number was found to be inadequate because, after all, a sense of being always temporary affects also the efficiency of the service. Therefore, within two years that number was increased to 80 per cent., so that you will find that 80 per cent. of those whose services were first requisitioned on a temporary basis have already been confirmed. So far as the others are concerned, on account of a number of facts which are entirely beyond our control, it is not open to Government to confirm them. But Government are taking other steps, and one of the other steps is, short of actual confirmation, to give them a status which can be called quasi-permanent status. It has got certain advantages and one of the advantages is that they would be entitled to be made permanent according as posts fall vacant. Assuming that the posts do not fall vacant, certain advantages are given to them. Gratuity is given to them, and a number of other advantages are given according to the rules that we made in 1949. Then, in the case of certain classes, for example, Assistant Superintendents and Assistants there also this question arose, and therefore, as a part of the reorganization scheme, Government also had a number of officers confirmed. Naturally, there were a very large number of temporary officers. Therefore, for them, a new class of establishment, known as regular temporary establishment, was instituted, and about 1,200 people have been

taken in. They would also be absorbed according as conditions permit.

Yesterday it was demanded that temporary Government servants with three years of service should be immediately made permanent. Now, is it possible for any Government, much less for a Government like the Government of India with all its liabilities, to make permanent or to confirm all these officers? We were also told that Government is spending money and the taxation limit had been reached. These two contentions are entirely inconsistent. Government have to take the middle course, and the middle course is to give the advantages of either confirmation or a stage of semi-permanency to as large a class of temporary persons as possible, and you would be surprised, Sir, to know that so far as these quasi-permanency certificates are concerned, they have been granted to 20,000 persons up to now. Every year, on a particular day, we find out the persons who are entitled to these certificates, and to them these certificates are issued.

The next point that was raised was that these Government servants are not allowed to have unions under the direction of outsiders. That again raises a fundamental question, I touched upon it just cursorily at the outset, but I would like to deal with it here. I shall finish in five minutes.

Mr. Speaker: Five minutes? He has already exceeded by about seven minutes.

Shri Datar: All right, I shall finish with this point.

So far as such unions are concerned, the policy of the Government is that there are two classes of servants. The first class is the industrial employees, for whom a larger measure of liberty can be given. But so far as the other class of persons are concerned, they are Government servants, who are directly dealing with the administration as such, and therefore a greater degree of loyalty is necessary in their case; so, the Government will not allow any private persons, leaders or workers, to become members of such associations, unless the Government are aware that that particular person has had a career or antecedent which is good. So far as these servants are concerned, they are never kept under surveillance at all. All such contentions that have been raised are entirely unfounded, and therefore I would request the House to take into account the fact that we have one of the best public services that any country can

(Shri Datar]

be proud of, and that all these high officers also are gradually adjusting themselves to the new set-up. If they do not, then naturally they have to get out. But happily for us, they are also patriots, and they are also Indians.

I would therefore request the members of this House to co-operate with the Government in reaching the ideals which have been laid down in the Five Year Plan, so far as the highest efficiency of the administration is concerned.

Shri Sarangadhar Das (Dhenkanal—West Cuttack): After listening to this peroration from the other side, which gives us an impression that "All's well with the world And God's in his heaven"! It is with trepidation that I have to tread the same ground. I am not going into the question of permanent or temporary employees. But I am more interested in the Central Administrative Board that has been formed, consisting of six or seven Secretaries, with the Chairman of the U.P.S.C. added to it, to act as Chairman, and an additional member. This Board controls the central services, and selects the officers from the States as well as the Centre, for the Central Pool, the officers from which would be taken when necessary into the higher administrative posts.

In the first place, the six or seven Secretaries who form the Board are themselves applicants for the Pool, and they want to remain in the Pool. It is very strange that the examinee himself becomes the examiner. Those, who have to go into the Pool, and are desirous of going into the Pool—otherwise they would revert to their own States—sit as examiners and take themselves in. This situation has created a sort of vested interest of this coterie of I.C.S. officers, who used to be called by us at one time as the "steel frame" but I think they are now a worse "steel frame" than previously, because each one of them has a number of followers, whom they circulate from one Ministry to another as Deputy Secretary, Joint Secretary or Secretary.

The purpose for which the Central All India Administrative Service was meant was that during the British days, it was the custom that an officer who came from the State stayed here for about three or four years, got wider experience, and then went back to his own State, to contribute the knowledge and experience he had gained here, in the service of his own State. But lately or I should say,

during the last ten or fifteen years, one who comes into the central service, does not want to go back, because Delhi life nowadays has a great appeal, with the gaiety of the polished society, not only of the officers, but also of business people who are trying to fish among these officers through their satellites.

Shri Jaipal Singh: Not true.

The Minister of Home Affairs and States (Dr. Katju): Sir, on a point of order. May I just intervene with your permission and say that my hon. friend is making rather uncalled for remarks against certain officers? Probably he ought to know that this Central Administrative Board deals only with the officers with posts in the Secretariat. Their recommendations are placed before a Cabinet Committee for appointments. Therefore the Board are not presiding over these appointments. I would rather urge, therefore, that when he says that they have got satellites who want to push them on etc., it is not proper.

Shri Sarangadhar Das: I notice that every time we say something about the officers—because they are the people who are implementing all the policies, and are ruling the country—or whenever we say anything—I am not mentioning anybody's name—immediately the hon. Home Minister goes into a huff and says.....

Dr. Katju: I say, 'Attack me, but do not attack the officers who are not here to defend themselves'.

Shri Sarangadhar Das: I am not attacking the officers. But the truth must be told. Now what is the truth? I am not taking the name of anybody, and I have never taken anybody's name at any time in this House, and I think that it is a bad thing to take anybody's name. I know well enough. I am a man of 66 and not a young child to be lectured to by people who are in charge of Home Ministry. (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Let there be no heat created over that point. It is a simple point. He is making a statement as to what he does not like, and I believe the hon. Home Minister is merely enlightening him on the facts. There the matter ends. Let us dis-passionately hear what he has to say, and hear each other.

Dr. Katju: It is not for me to teach anybody.

Shri Sarangadhar Das: I know there is a small Cabinet Committee that decides finally, but I know from the ways of the world that the subordinate Committee, who go into the details of it, make the decision, and it may be very rarely that the upper Committee—the superior Committee—with all powers vested in them will make a change here or there. Otherwise, the whole thing, as it has been done by the lower Committee, stands.

Mr. Speaker: I wanted a clarification on one point. I thought what the hon. the Home Minister wanted to clarify was that this Committee had to do only with the appointments in the Central Secretariat. Am I right there?

Dr. Katju: They deal with only officers on the Secretariat posts.

Mr. Speaker: That means the Government of India Central Secretariat.

Dr. Katju: That is right, and then they make recommendations which go before the.....

Mr. Speaker: The point of the hon. Member, I thought, was that they decide as to who is to be taken from parts all over India.....

Shri Sarangadhar Das: Yes.

Mr. Speaker:to the Central Service kept in the Pool. Am I right in understanding the hon. Member's point?

Shri Sarangadhar Das: Yes.

Shri Jaipal Singh: I think what the hon. Member said was that the same person acted as examiner and examinee. I think that point has to be clarified.

Mr. Speaker: Let us clarify now as to the difference between the two. The hon. Minister is referring to one thing and the hon. Member is referring to quite another Pool.

Dr. Katju: He never referred to the Pool.

Shri Sarangadhar Das: A Central Pool in which officers from all the States are selected and kept there to be taken into the different Ministries as higher administrative officers when necessary. I should like to know if that Pool exists.

Dr. Katju: They are selected for the Pool and they are appointed. The proposals for their appointment come before the Appointments Committee of the Cabinet. Mere selection means nothing.

When I intervened—I do not want to take the time of the House—my hon. friend was saying, as I understood him, that the people having come here do not want to leave Delhi and these officers in the Central Establishment Board have got their own satellites, they have got their own followers and they back them up and they do not want to go back out of Delhi. That was what I was objecting to.

Mr. Speaker: The position is now clear. There is a Central Pool and the hon. Member's allegation, as I understand it, is that people who are not liked by this Committee have no chance of entering the Pool.

Babu Ramnarayan Singh (Hazari-bagh West): Hear, hear. That is the point.

Shri Sarangadhar Das: Yes, that is the point.

Dr. Katju: You are making the point for them, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: No, no.

Shri Sarangadhar Das: I know there are several officers in the Secretariat who are circulating from one Ministry to another. Some of them have seen three or four Ministries. So when I say that they do not wish to go back to their provinces, I am quite correct. I think I will also be supported in this contention by many Members of this House.

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): What will they do in the 'dry' provinces?

Shri Sarangadhar Das: I am not jealous of the officers. I am not jealous of their salaries and I am not jealous of the power they have. What I am interested in is that the administration should be of a very high order not only at the Centre but in the States. We had a system of sending State officers to the Centre to get wider experience and to be able to do more efficient work, for the higher body was supposed to have higher efficiency. And then the officers used to go back to the States and contribute that wide knowledge and experience for the good of their own States. That is not being done. Consequently, when we talk of toning up the administration and in one place or another we have to put up with these handicaps, how is it possible that the administration could be toned up?

My suggestion is that this Central Board should not consist of these Secretaries. This work of selecting

[Shri Sarangadhar Das]

officers for the Pool should be in the hands of the Union Public Services Commission, or else directly in the hands of a small Sub-Committee of the Cabinet. In that case, there will be no more frustration, as there is, in certain ranks in the Secretariat here, because there are officers who are superseded by junior officers who go up to the post of Deputy Secretary or some higher post while the senior officers in the lower grades remain where they are.

There is another thing about the Central Board. As far as I understand, reliably, they also interfere with the recommendations of a Ministry. There was a case of a very high officer—the Head of a Department. There were some allegations against him and the Minister recommended that he should be suspended. It is said—I say it is said—subject to correction—that the Board tried to throw impediments in the way of this Ministry and then the matter was given to a High Court Judge who found that almost all the items of the allegations were correct. I do not know what has happened to the officer, but what I wish to point out here is that the Board is so powerful—or at least some of the members of that Board are so powerful—that they went to the extent of trying to defend that officer, saying that it was very wrong to bring such allegations against a high officer. This is also another proof that this Board has become a steel frame worse than in the British days.

I wish to say a few words about economy. Several years ago the Estimates Committee had made certain recommendations which I do not think have yet been carried out—that is, to enforce economy in the different Ministries. The Finance Ministry itself has two Secretaries, each of them on Rs. 4,000 a month. Now this Ministry was being managed by one Secretary during the British period. I do not see why it should be necessary to have two Secretaries for the same administration.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

If the Finance Ministry has two Secretaries, how can it go—with what face can it go—to other Ministries and recommend that they should effect economy? There is also in the Home Ministry itself a very high officer as Special Secretary. There are two Secretaries in the Home Ministry and I think the Works, Housing and Supply Ministry also has two Secretaries. I say that if one

Secretary with all the Under Secretaries, Deputy Secretaries, Assistant Secretaries and Personal Assistant to the Secretary and then a Personal Assistant to that Personal Assistant, if with all these people one man is not able to handle the enlarged amount of work then he should go. Other men should be brought in, and I believe in the services—All India Services—there are men—individuals—who can do the work singly with all the staff under them.

4 P.M.

There is another thing about economy, also connected with the stoppage of this pomp and show. The Minister has half a dozen chaprasi; a high officer has two or three; an Under-Secretary has one. Again, I say I am not jealous of the Minister having half a dozen or—if I am wrong may be two—whatever the number is. Now, in British days, say 40 or 50 years ago, there was no telephone; the telegraph service was very little. Consequently, these chaprasi were required to take a chit from this man to that man, sometimes take mails. Mails in those days were not being sent by post, but a man had to take it from Simla to Delhi or Simla to Calcutta, to act as couriers. But, with the telephone and the telegraph and all the modern convenience, it is not necessary to have this elaborate chaprasi system.

बाबू रामनारायण सिंह : तब रसीदें

कौन दनाएगा ?

Shri Sarangadhar Das : बाज़ार

कौन करेगा ।

What I am concerned with is not the saving of the little money; after all, it is little money that will be saved. But, there are two things. One is that in a democracy this pomp and show does not at all fit in. Just today when I came a little early, I saw about four or five chaprasi sitting there in the steps in the portico waiting for the Minister's car to come so that they may open the door for the Minister and take his portfolio and the Minister can walk in without any encumbrance. In a democracy one should be ashamed of having to rely on men to carry his little bundle; to carry a little file or portfolio. If any Minister is going out of this House, the chaprasi is standing there and immediately the Minister reaches the *purdah*, he takes the file from the Minister and the Minister goes out unencumbered. This must

stop. If the people who work in various capacities are not producing anything they should be put in somewhere where they will produce something. I do not know how many thousand chaprasis there are wasting the nation's time. It is not the little money that matters but they are wasting the nation's time which should be usefully utilised. And the self-respect of these men must be re-established.

Then I come to the Central Police establishment.

Babu Ramnarayan Singh: What about the army of Ministers?

Shri Sarangadhar Das: The Central Deputy Minister said that there were so many cases that have been registered. We have no interest in the number of cases registered but we are interested in the number of convictions. Saying that hundreds of cases have been registered does not bring credit. Some time ago, when we discussed in the Commerce Ministry, a case of licence for importation of two lakhs of cycles that was given by the Commerce Ministry was referred to. Some days after I had spoken, the then Minister who is now a Member of Parliament said that he was the man who had started the enquiry into this case, not only through the Commerce Ministry but also through the Home Ministry. Then there was a question as to what had happened. At that time, the licensee who had taken the licence had brought a case in the High Court of Orissa complaining that the search was illegal. Consequently, it was *sub judice*. Now, I will read a portion from the judgement of the High Court of Orissa dated 2nd December, 1952. It says:

"It is further stated therein that in the Police Inspector's application to the Magistrate asking for permission for search warrant that the said Company, the Eastern Mercantile Corporation Ltd., Cuttack, obtained licence No. 002626/51 CCI, Government of India to import complete cycles to the tune of 2 lakhs for internal consumption of Orissa State. It is also stated that it has been reliably learnt that this licence which was meant for the internal consumption of Orissa State was black-marketed at Calcutta and thus a fraud was committed on the Ministry of Commerce and that this also amounted to an offence under the Import and Export Control Act, 1947."

I need not read any further. The judgement of the High Court,—the Chief Justice and another Judge sitting together is:

Having, therefore, given our best consideration to the facts and circumstances of the case, we are not prepared to say that the issue of the search warrants in these cases is illegal."

The High Court case is finished and four months have gone by and I should like to know from the Minister himself what steps the Ministry is taking to pursue this matter.

Pandit M. B. Bhargava (Ajmer South): We are discussing since yesterday Demands for Grants in respect of the Ministry of Home Affairs and the Ministry of States. No doubt this entire huge administrative apparatus of the Government of India depends upon the efficiency, honesty, and integrity of the services; and the Home Ministry is the backbone of the entire administrative machinery. Since yesterday, we have been hearing unqualified denunciation of our services. A section of the Opposition has characterised the services as wholly incompetent, inefficient and corrupt. On the other hand we have heard something in praise of the services. But one thing cannot be denied by any critic. The past five or six years have been very critical in the history of our country and it cannot possibly be questioned that if the services, on the whole, had not behaved loyally, honestly and sincerely it would have been impossible for our national leaders to tide over this great crisis. Consequently, the wholesale denunciation of our services is absolutely unjustified and is nothing but a display of extreme irresponsibility.

One thing we must keep in mind. Most of the personnel of our services have come from the British days and there is absolutely no doubt that the bureaucratic arrogance and isolationism which characterised the ICS service have, to a certain extent, percolated to our services. What we need is a revolutionary change in their outlook towards the common man. The brunt of the implementation of the Five Year Plan will fall on the services, and before they can effectively translate that plan into action, they must develop a spirit whereby they may come into contact with the mass of the population. That element is now lacking. I do not know what are the courses of subjects taught in the I.A.S., I.P.S. and Central Secretariat training schools, but I would suggest to the Home Minister that one of the essential courses of

[Pandit M. B. Bhargava]

training is social science. Our officers must have that training in the field before they join the service. This is essential in the changed circumstances of the country.

Then, it cannot be denied that there is scope for much economy. Economy is the essential need of the hour. How far has the reorganising wing of the Home Ministry succeeded in toning up efficiency and effecting economy? In this connection, I would draw your attention to the Estimates Committee report for 1950-51. While scrutinising the Ministry of Commerce and Industry, the Committee made certain recommendations of a general character which applied not only to the Ministry of Commerce and Industry but to the entire services. These recommendations were contained in Report No. 2, signed by the distinguished members of the Committee on 9th February, 1951, and covered a very wide field. The Committee suggested that certain very remunerative supervisory posts like Joint Secretary, Additional Secretary, Deputy Director-General, Under Secretary etc. were, in the view of the Committee, absolutely redundant. In the words of the Committee, "effective and urgent action" was to be taken to scrutinise these posts and wind them up, and also stop their future creation. I would like to know whether the Home Minister has had the leisure to look at those recommendations.

Also, what is the constitutional position regarding the Estimates Committee recommendations? As far as I know, it is a select committee of the House and ordinarily its recommendations must be binding on the Government. If, for certain reasons, Government are not in a position to accept them, then Government must place their explanation before the House together with the reasons for non-acceptance.

Similarly, in respect of tenure of service, the Estimates Committee recommended the introduction of the practice which had been previously in vogue namely, a regular interchange of superior officers from the Centre to the States and vice versa. That was a very healthy practice, and in the Estimates Committee's view, the present practice whereby officers are kept at the Centre for all times created a rigidity and fixity of mentality which was not desirable. In the interests of diffusion of ideas, ideologies and policies as between the Centre and the States, the Committee recommended the adoption of the previous practice,

I would like to know what has been done in this respect.

Then another very important recommendation of the Estimates Committee was about officers drawing above Rs. 3000. The Pay Commission had recommended that the highest salary payable to an officer should be Rs. 3000. Government accepted that recommendation. The suggestion of the Estimates Committee was that influence should be brought to bear upon those officers who draw over Rs. 3000 and they should be induced to surrender a portion voluntarily. I would like to know what has been done in this respect.

We read in the papers that the Punjab Government has laid down a rule that officers drawing above Rs. 750 should not claim dearness or conveyance allowance. If it could be done in Punjab, why could not the same thing be done here? It cannot be denied that the disparity between the official at the lowest ring of the ladder and the official at the top is a big one. The Government is for reducing that disparity, and every year the Finance Minister in his Budget speech says that the drive and the search for economy are continuing. This ever-continuing search, as far as I know has not yielded any results, and perhaps it never will. But economy, however small it may be, has its own psychological effect, and apart from its money value, it is bound to create a good sense for the honesty and sincerity of the Government in wanting to reduce whatever expenditure it can possibly reduce.

Another recommendation of the Estimates Committee was in regard to the array of Assistants. Among the ministerial staff, the number of Assistants was only about 500 in 1939, but in 1951 it was nearly five times that number. Therefore, the Estimates Committee suggested—and they gave very cogent and strong arguments—that much of the work done by Assistants might be entrusted to routine or clerical grade people. The practice in 1938 was that there were three grades of ministerial staff: grade three clerks; grade two clerks and Assistants. The Estimates Committee recommended that grade two clerks should be reintroduced and those Assistants whose work is more or less of a routine or clerical nature should be downgraded and brought to the rank of grade two clerks. This would effect economy and also improve efficiency.

Another suggestion of the Estimates Committee related to the method

of recruitment. Prior to the war, Assistants were recruited through competitive examination. That practice was given up during the war. It is still in vogue and all Assistants are recruited, not through competitive examination but from the open market. There is much room for, and many complaints about, nepotism and favouritism. Therefore, the Estimates Committee suggested the adoption of the previous system of recruitment of Assistants through competitive examination. I would like to know what has been done in this respect.

Then the Committee referred to the number of peons, whom they called an "army of peons". They said that they had examined the Commerce and Industry Ministry and their view was that the number of peons was far above requirements. They suggested the introduction of the messenger service system and reduction of this army of peons. I would like to know whether anything has been done by Government in this respect.

Then there was also a question of economy in respect of use of telephones. It was suggested by the Estimates Committee that a telephone at home is not necessary in the case of all those officers who have got them now. The Committee said that the cases must be scrutinised and only those officers who require the telephones for Governmental purposes should be allowed to have them. It was also suggested that a maximum number of local calls should be fixed and if a larger number of calls are put through, then the charge for 50 per cent. of the additional calls should be borne by the officer himself. In respect of trunk calls, the Committee suggested that there must be a register opened in which each call must be entered. This was suggested for the purpose of economy. I would like to know what has been done by Government in this respect. The Report of the Estimates Committee has been before Parliament for the last two years and I would like to know whether Government can ignore the recommendations of this body which is but a reflection of the opinion of this House. With this cry of economy, with this criticism all around, inside Parliament and outside it, the indifference of Government is simply understandable.

The second point that has emerged in the debate is in respect of Part C States. It was contested and submitted by some of my hon. friends that these States need not be allowed to exist as they are existing today and 30 PSD

that they must be forthwith merged with the contiguous area. I would like to remind the House that it was after considerable discussion that the previous Parliament in November, 1951 passed the Part C States Bill, as it considered it not possible and expedient under the existing circumstances to merge the States which have got a history behind them forthwith the contiguous area. The experiment of responsible Government has been in existence in these States only, for a very small period of eleven months. It is too premature to give any verdict as to the advisability of the experiment or otherwise. My submission is that the question that was only very recently decided should not be reopened so lightly. Even, if it is to be reopened you cannot ignore the views of the people of those areas as also of the Legislatures which have been elected on adult franchise.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member must conclude now. I find several hon. Members are anxious to speak and if each hon. Member were to take three or four minutes more, some of them will not get a chance.

Pandit M. B. Bhargava: The third point to which I would respectfully draw the attention of the hon. the Home Minister is that the question of Abu is one of life and death for Rajasthan. Geographically, culturally, linguistically and historically, that territory has been a part and parcel of Rajasthan. Since the Ministry has already decided that the matter needs review, I would submit that it may be expedited and Abu restored to Rajasthan.

श्री नामधारी (फाजिल्का-सिरसा):

माननीय उपाध्यक्ष जी, मैं.....

Shri Nambiar: (Mayuram): Please speak in English.

श्री नामधारी: I cannot give step-motherly treatment to my language.

मैं माननीय होम मिनिस्टर को मुबारकबाद देने में उन भाइयों के साथ शामिल होता हूँ जिन्होंने मुझ से पहले उन्हें धन्यवाद दिया है। लेकिन तभी मेरे दिमाग में एक सवाल पैदा हुआ कि यह होम मिनिस्ट्री इन कम्युनलिस्टों के इतने शोरशराबे और तूफान उठाने के बाद एक मजबूत चट्टान की तरह कैसे खड़ी रही और कैसे सारा इन्तज़ाम अपना मुकम्मिल रक्खा और कोई गड़बड़

[श्री नामधारी]

नहीं होने दी। इस प्रश्न का उत्तर खुदबखुद मेरे पास आ गया कि जैसे कैलाश पर्वत एक बड़ी मजबूत चीज है, उसी तरह इस महकमे के मालिक भी तो कैलाश के नाथ पति उसके मालिक हैं, इस वास्ते यह कोई ताज्जुब की बात नहीं। और मैं इसी सिलसिले में अपने भाइयों का ध्यान जरा भगवान विष्णु के चित्र की तरफ दिलाना चाहता हूँ, भगवान विष्णु को चार भुजायें हैं और चारों भुजाओं में से हमें एक एक ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेशन का सार मिलता है। एक भुजा में चक्र है, चक्र का मतलब स्पीड से होता है, इस कलयुग के काल में थोड़ी सी आयु होने से एक सेकेंड भी जाया नहीं करना चाहिये। दूसरी भुजा में शंख है, यह शंख उस प्रोपेगन्डा से बचाने के लिये है जिसके जरिये यह लोगों को एक्सप्लायट करते हैं और धोखा देते हैं, उस धोखे से बचाने के वास्ते वह शंख हाथ में रखते हैं, आज जो लोग अननो उंगली में खून लगाकर शहीद होने वाली पार्टी के साथ हो गये हैं, वह पार्टी जिसने पिछले सौ वर्ष में भारत माना की आजाद कराने के लिये कुर्बानी की, आज यह उसके मुकाबले में खड़े हो गये हैं, तो उस शंख के द्वारा लोगों को उन कम्युनिस्टों के मिथ्या प्रचार से सावधान करना है। तीसरी भुजा में लक्ष्मी जो खड़ी है जिसका मतलब यह हुआ कि हमें सदा अपने मुल्क को फाइनेंशियल पोजीशन को साउन्ड रखना है, क्योंकि जिस देश की आर्थिक पोजीशन कमजोर हो जाती है, वह देश दुनिया में चल नहीं सकता। और चौथी भुजा में गदा है, डंडा है और वह होना निहायत जरूरी है और मैं समझता हूँ कि भगवान विष्णु का जो मैंने वर्णन किया है उससे हमें पूरा सबक मिल जाता है कि किस तरह हमें अपने देश का शासन कार्य चलाना चाहिए और

मैं तो समझता हूँ कि अगर हम अपने ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेशन को उनके नक्शे कदम पर चलायें तो हम अपने देश का भलीभांति सफलतापूर्वक इन्तजाम कर सकते हैं।

मैं अपने उन हिन्दूसभाई और रामराज्य परिषद वाले भाइयों की सेवा में यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि आप क्यों उन कम्युनिस्टों के साथ घुस कर बंटे हुए हैं, आपके और उनके बीच में तो कुछ भी कौमन नहीं है। मैं बड़े अदब से कहना चाहूँगा कि दुनिया में प्रत्यक्ष को प्रमाण की जरूरत नहीं होती। आपने देखा कि किस प्रकार महात्मम गांधी ने सत्य और अहिंसा पर चलकर राम की शक्ति से बड़े बड़े हवाई जहाजों, एटम बमों और तोपों आदि का मुंह बन्द कर दिया और एक मन्त्र उम्र राम की शक्ति से, रघुपति रावत्र राजा राम के बत पर देश को विजयश्री पहनाई और देश ने आजादी प्राप्त की। इसलिये मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि उस राम को जिसको आप और हम दोनों नमस्कार करते हैं उस राम का नाम लेकर और उसके भक्ति बज से जिन लोगों ने भारत के लिये आजादी प्राप्त की, उन लोगों और पंडित जवाहर लाल सरोखे देशभक्त वीरों की मुखालफत करके आप कहीं के भी नहीं रहेंगे, मैं आपको सावधान किये देता हूँ कि दुनिया की कोई ताकत भी जब तक दूध यानी सच्चाई हमारे पास है, हमको खत्म नहीं कर सकती, लेकिन अगर हममें सच्चाई अब नहीं रह गई है, तो फिर जरूर हमारा अन्त हो जाना चाहिये, मैं तो इस बात के हक में हूँ। राम नाम में कितनी शक्ति है, इसका प्रत्यक्ष प्रमाण मैंने आपके सामने बतलाया। इसी सिलसिले में मैं आपसे अर्ज करूँ कि एक दफा जयपुर में मैं तकरीर कर रहा था तो मेरे ऊपर यह सवाल किया गया कि वह सीता माता

जो अपनी रसोई में झाड़ू देने वक्त शिव धनुष को एक हाथ से उठाकर झाड़ू दे दिया करती थी, और जो धनुष स्वयंबर में रावण से उठाया नहीं गया। उन सीता माता को रावण कैसे उठाकर ले गया ? लेकिन जवाब मुझे मिल गया, सीता माता जगदम्बा थी और सर्वशक्तिमान् थी, लेकिन उनके पतिदेव और आराध्यदेव ने कुटिया के बाहर जो उनके लिये एक लकीर खींच दी थी मर्यादा बांधी थी, उसका उन्होंने उल्लंघन किया और शार्ट सरकट हुआ इसलिये बल जाता रहा और इस कारण रावण उनका हरण करने में कामयाब हो सका, तो इससे हमें यही सबक लेना चाहिए कि हमें अहंकार छोड़ महात्मा जी के पदचिन्हों और बताए हुए मार्ग पर भक्तिभाव से आगे बढ़ते रहना चाहिए।

तो मेरे अर्ज करने का मतलब यह है कि बात तो यह होनी चाहिए थी कि धर्म की ताकत से यह चीज प्राप्त होती है। संक्रिफाइस करनी होती है, पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू ऐसे ही आ कर यहां नहीं बैठ गये। अपनी फैमलीज की कुर्बानी के बाद यहां आये। आप लोगों को इस बात को सोचना चाहिए और झगड़े को मिटाना चाहिए, बढ़ाना नहीं चाहिए।

कश्मीर के बारे में इतनी चर्चा हुई जो कि मेरे समझ में नहीं आई। आप को मालूम है कि हमारी गवर्नमेंट सेकुलर गवर्नमेंट है, सेकुलर गवर्नमेंट कौन होती है ? गवर्नमेंट आफ गाड। जैसे ईश्वर की खुदाई में सब इन्सानों को बराबर का हक है उसी तरह सेकुलर गवर्नमेंट में हर इन्सान बराबर के हक से रह सकता है। तो सेकुलर गवर्नमेंट का हमारे ऊपर क्या असर हुआ ? आप यह देखिये कि हमारा इससे इतना फायदा हुआ है कि

आज पाकिस्तान एक आइलैंड बन गया है और तमाम मुसलिम पावर्स हमारी दोस्त हैं। हिन्दुस्तान के लिये त्रिगैडियर उस्मान जैसे आदमियों ने जान दी, हमारी गोमाता की रक्षा के लिए हमारे मुसलमान भाइयों ने जोर दे कर दिल्ली में गोबध बन्द करवाया। यह हमारी सेकुलर गवर्नमेंट और हमारी सेकुलर पालिसी का असर हुआ है, इसे आप को देखना चाहिए, इसमें हम लोगों को झगड़ा नहीं करना चाहिए। अगर हमारी सेकुलर पालिसी न होती तो पंजाब एक कीरिया बन गया होता।

[PANDIT THAKUR DAS BHARGAVA in the Chair]

आज पंजाब मौलाना आजाद और पंडित नेहरू की सेकुलर पालिसी की वजह से बचा हुआ है नहीं तो वहां लाखों आदमियों का खून हो गया होता। हिन्दू तो बड़ी भारी चीज थी, वह एक समुद्र था जिस में आस्तिक भी आ सकता था और नास्तिक भी आ सकता था। इस लिये आप बड़े हिन्दू बनिये, छोटे हिन्दू न बनिये जिस में आप सारे मुल्क की तरक्की कर सकें।

जब मैं नें कश्मीर के मामले को देखा तो उस में मुझे गड़बड़ की बात ही नजर नहीं आई। २२ अक्टूबर को अटैक होता है, २३ अक्टूबर को राजा साहब भाग जाते हैं, २२ तारीख को अटैक होता है और मुजफर-बाद में नेशनल कान्फरेन्स के लीडर मास्टर अब्दुल अजीज को गोली से मार दिया जाता है। उस के बाद बारामूला में एक नेशनल कान्फरेन्स के लीडर को दरख्त से बांध कर चौदह गोलियों से मारा जाता है। दूसरी जगह पुँछ में नेशनल कान्फरेन्स के लीडर को उल्टा लटकाया और नीचे से आग लगा कर खत्म किया गया। उस के बाद भी वहां के मुसलमानों ने क्या क्या जल्म सहे। अगर उनके दिल में मुसलमान होने का ख्याल

[श्री नामा री]

होता तो बड़े प्रेम से कल्मा शरीफ पढ़ कर अपने पाकिस्तानी भाइयों से मिल सकते थे । सोचना तो यह चाहिए था कि उस तूफानी बदतमीजी में भी जब कि जम्मू में मुसलमानों का खात्मा हो रहा था यह लोग हमारे साथ नहे । इस सब को देख कर कम से कम हम को सब बातों का फँसला प्रेम से करना चाहिए था । उन्होंने झंडे की बात्र को मान लिया और सदरे रियासत की बात को भी मान लिया । जब तक राष्ट्रपति जी कन्फर्म नहीं करेंगे तब तक कोई आदमी सदरे रियासत नहीं हो सकता । इन हालात में क्या ज़रूरत है मुल्क में गड़बड़ी फैलाने की ? अगर थोड़ी सहूलियत से गौर किया जाय तो कोई गड़बड़ी की बात इस में आपको नजर नहीं आयेगी ।

राजप्रमुखों के बारे में मैंने कल दो तीन बातें सुनी । मैं तो इस बात पर यकीन करता हूँ कि जो सच्चाई की बात है उस को अपने बाप से कहने में भी हर्ज नहीं होता । और हमारी तो सम्यता ही है कि "रघुकुल रीति सदा चलि आई, प्राण जाहि पर बचन न जाही ।" अगर हम अपने वचनों से कभी भी हटेंगे ठीक न होगा । हम तमाम रियासतों को दो कंटेगिरी में रखते हैं । एक तो हमारे नेशनल हीरोज हैं जिन्होंने खुद ब खुद अपनी रियासतें आफर की हैं जैसे खालियर है, पटियाला है, जयपुर है दूसरी कंटेगिरी ऐसी रियासतों की है जैसे हैदराबाद, कश्मीर और जूना गढ़ जिन्होंने हम से मिल कर काम नहीं किया और हमको सर्जन बन कर काम लेना पड़ा है । उनके साथ आप अपनी मर्जी से जैसा चाहे ट्रीटमेंट कीजिये । हमने राजप्रमुखों को अफसर बना कर के नहीं रखा है, हम ने तो उन की स्पिरिट देखी है उन को नेशनल हीरोज मान कर उन की जगहों पर कायम किया है । आपको भी इसी नुक्तें नजर से सोचना चाहिये ।

दूसरी बात में सिख भाइयों से कहना चाहता हूँ कि वह किसी गलतफहमी के शिकार न हों । क्यों कि जहां तक हर हिन्दुस्तानी के साथ गवर्नमेंट के ताल्लुक का सवाल है वह तो सब के साथ युनिवर्सली हमदर्द है, वह सब के साथ एक सा मुलुक करना चाहती है, यह बात दूसरी है कि किसी की लीडरशिप में कमा आती हो इसलिये वह लोगों को गुमराह करने की बात करे । मैंने देखा अखबार में कि जो बड़ी भारी अकालियों की कान्फेन्स हुई उस में उन्होंने ऐसी बातें कहीं जो ठीक नहीं हैं । मैं नहीं चाहता कि सिक्ख कौम मिसलीड हो क्यों कि सिक्ख कौम के साथ मुझे हमदर्दी है । वह तो हमारे बहादुर सिपाही हैं, लेकिन वह इतने नेक नियत हैं कि वह बहुत जल्द प्रोपेगेंडा के शिकार हो जाते हैं । इस लिये मैं उनको सावधान करना अपना फर्ज समझता हूँ । उन्होंने कहा कि पेप्सू ओनली नान कांग्रेस मिनिस्ट्री थी जिस को उन्होंने हटाया लेकिन यह बात बिल्कुल गलत है । पेप्सू की बात को छोड़िये क्योंकि वहां हमारी सिर्फ तीन आदमियों की मंजारिटी थी । पंजाब की कांग्रेस मिनिस्ट्री को जिस में ८० आदमियों की मंजारिटी थी, उसको पहले खत्म किया । असल बात यह कि मैं तो यह समझता हूँ कि राष्ट्रपति जी की पालिसी बड़ा मुबारक खयाल है । वह किस वजह से ? इस वजह से कि हिन्दुस्तान में जितनी मिनिस्ट्रियां हैं, कांग्रेस या नान कांग्रेस वह इस डर से करप्शन, नेपाटिज्म वगैरह को दूर कर देंगे । यह सवाल मंजारिटी या नान-मंजारिटी का नहीं है । सवाल एफिशिएन्सी का है । इस लिये यह कहना गलत बात है कि नान-कांग्रेस मिनिस्ट्री पर अटक किया गया । सब से पहले कांग्रेस मिनिस्ट्री को खत्म किया गया ।

दूसरी बात यह कही जाती है कि सिक्खों में से गेड्यूल्ड कास्ट के लोगों के साथ बड़ा बुरा सलूक हुआ। हिन्दुओं की ३४ जातों के लीं और सिक्खों की सिर्फ चार जातों लीं। मैंने सरदार पटेल की स्पीच का पुराना रिकार्ड भी देखा। उसमें पहले ज्ञानी कर्तार सिंह ने कहा कि सिक्खों में कोई जात पात नहीं है, कोई शेड्यूल्ड कास्ट नहीं है, लेकिन जब देखा कि मिठाई बंटने लगी है तो कहने लगे कि हम में गेड्यूल्ड कास्ट भी हैं। तो उस वक्त उन्होंने ने कम्प्रोमाइज किया कि हमारी चार जातों के लो तो ठीक हो जायगा। मैं समझता हूँ कि उन्होंने ने सिक्खों के साथ बड़ी भारी डिससर्विस की, चीज को गलत रिप्रेजेंट करके। यहां कोई रिलिजन का सवाल नहीं था। बाप सिक्ख है, बेटा हिन्दू है। तो हिन्दू तो ३४ में आ जाते हैं लेकिन सिक्ख नहीं आते हैं। मैं उन से कहना हूँ कि जहां तक सिक्खों का सवाल है उन के लिये सब ठीक हो जायगा। बैंकवर्ड क्वासेज कमीशन बन चुका है। उसमें सारी बातें देखी जायेंगी और जो वाजिब होगा वह किया जायेगा, लेकिन उनको पोजिटिव कं पिटल नहीं बनाने दिया जायेगा कि वह कइँ कि सरकार ने सिक्ख क्रोम के साथ गलत काम किया। ऐसी ऐसी ही बातें सिक्खों को गलत बतलाई जाती हैं। आप को मैं यकीन दिलाता हूँ कि सेकुलर गवर्नमेन्ट हो जाने में हर धर्म की रक्षा करना, हर मजहब से प्रेम करना हर इन्सान का फर्ज है। आप को याद होगा कि सिक्खों की कृपाण की पवित्रता के लिये अंगरेजी राज्य में सिक्खों को कितनी जद्दो जहद करनी पड़ी। बड़े बड़े लीडर क्रैद हुए। और बाद में अंग्रेजों ने कृपाण को आजाद किया। लेकिन हमारी गवर्नमेन्ट कृपाण की पवित्रता का ख्याल करते हुए उस को आजाद रखा और अपने विधान में एन्टर किया कि यह सिर्फ सिक्खों के लिये किया गया है। लोगों में

गलतफहमी फैलाते हैं कि सिक्खों को सर्वसंज नहीं है, उनके साथ कोई फालोइंग नहीं है। मैं समझता हूँ कि जैसे ध्यानचन्द जैसे हाकी के प्लेअर कोई हो तो उस को टीम में खिलाया ही जायगा। चूँकि सिक्खों को गुरु की बख्ती हुई चीजें हैं इस लिये वह खुद ही अपने आप आ जाती हैं। पंजाब के तीन मिनिस्टर सिक्ख हैं, इन्स्पेक्टर पुलिस, चीफ सेक्रेटरी, होम सेक्रेटरी, इन्स्पेक्टर जनरल कश्मीर, और सेन्टर में एक नहीं दो मिनिस्टर सिक्ख। यह बात दूसरी है कि गुरु साहब के सिख यहां हो गये हैं, दूसरे नहीं हुए हैं। इसका इन्तजाम नहीं किया जा सकता। मेरे अर्ज करने का मतलब यह है कि मुझे अकाली जनता से प्रेम है, तमाम सिक्खों की सेवा करने के लिये हम तैयार हैं, लेकिन जो लोग लीडरशिप के लालच में आकर प्रोपेगेंडा कर के टूबल पैदा करना चाहें उन से मैं कहूँगा कि वह सिक्खों के साथ भलाई नहीं कर रहे हैं। लाहौर में इस पालिसी ने मुसलिम लीग का झंडा फाड़ा और हमारे हज्जारों और राबलपिडी के बहुत से हिन्दू और सिक्ख तबाह हुए। अब सिक्खों को भ्रम न होना चाहिये। अगर उन को भ्रम में डाला गया और उन को मुसीबत में डाला गया तो उन की तबाही का कौन जिम्मेदार होगा। मैं अपील करता हूँ बुजुर्गों की हैसियत में मैं हर लीडर की इज्जत करता हूँ कि वह मुल्क को आगे जाने के लिये छोड़ दें। आप में से जो लोग ताश खेलते होंगे वह जानते होंगे कि एक से दो मारा जाता है तीन से दो को और बादशाह से बंगम को मारा जाता है लेकिन बादशाह को हक्का मार देता है। यानी यूनिटी से सब कुछ हो सकता है। तां इस का मतलब यह है कि सिक्खों को इकट्ठा होना चाहिये। हम सब की खिदमत करने को तैयार हैं, हम किसी को नुकसान नहीं पहुंचाना चाहते। अगर एक आबमी बड़ा पुराना लीडर है तो ठीक है, मुबारक है।

[श्री नामधारी]

हम शस्त्री तौर पर उन को इज्जत करने को तैयार हैं, लेकिन अगर आप भां बच्चे को मारना शुरू कर देंगे तो उस को तो रोकना ही पड़ेगा। किसी तरह हमारी क्रीम तो तबाही से बचे।

उन्होंने तो सरदार हुकुम सिंह जैसे नेक आदमी को प्रेमीडेंट से निकाल दिया। जितने पहले अकाली प्रेमीडेंट थे बाबा खड़ग सिंह और दूसरे लोग जिन्होंने ने कुरबानियां करके सिक्खों की शान को चमकाया था उन सब को निकाल दिया। मैं अखिर में यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि लोगों को धोखा दिया जा रहा है कि तत्कालीन कांग्रेस ने करवाई। मैं कांग्रेस को ३० साल से देख रहा हूँ। मुस्लिम लीग ने डिमांड किया और अकालियों ने आज़ाद पंजाब मूवमेंट शुरू किया डिबीजन से एक दो साल पहले। मैं ने अपोजीशन को लीड किया। सिर्फ़ फ़र्क यह था कि बाउंडरी चिनाव पर हो जाय या रावी पर हो जाय। कांग्रेस को कम्युनलिस्टों ने कारगर कर लिया और वह मजबूर हो गई इस बात को मानने के लिये। तो खुद ने तो तत्कालीन की और लोगों को मरवाया और आप ही चौधरी बन रहे हैं। मैं ज्यादा वक्त नहीं लेना चाहता। १५ मिनट का वक्त मुझे मिला है। टाइम के लिहाज़ से तो यह ठीक है लेकिन मेरी कैपेसिटी और बाल्युम को देखते हुए यह वक्त कम मिला है।

एक बात मैं और कह देना चाहता हूँ बैकवर्ड क्लास कमीशन के बारे में। यह कहा जा रहा है कि ११ मेम्बरों में से सिर्फ़ एक ही सिक्ख मेम्बर है। मुल्क की आबादी ३३ करोड़ है। इस हिसाब से ३ करोड़ पर एक मेम्बर होना चाहिये। मगर सिक्ख तो ५० लाख ही हैं फिर भी एक मेम्बर सिक्ख बनाया गया है। तो इस सारी बात को सोचना चाहिये। मैं इस से ज्यादा कुछ नहीं कहना चाहता। मैं सब से यही अपील

करता हूँ कि जहाँ तक हो सके ताकत को बढ़ाओ, प्रेम को बढ़ाओ और मासेज का फ़ायदा देखो, जाती फ़ायदा न देखो। मैं तो ऐलान करता हूँ कि अगर नेशन मुझे चपरसी का काम भी दे तो मैं उसे फ़रक के साथ करूँगा।

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: Our colleagues on either side of the House have already dealt at length with the workings of the Ministry of State in general and the grievances of my State in particular. I would like to raise only some of the points that were left out.

Firstly I would like to point out emphatically that this poor land has not yet dispensed with the system of Rajpramukhs and continues to pay a sum of Rs. 4.40,80,000 as privy purse every year. We have to put an end to this anachronism and the sooner it is done the better.

Another matter of great importance which I would like to point out to this House is about the great injustice shown to the ex-State employees before and after they were integrated in the federal services. The categorisation has been made on the basis of the salaries they were drawing under the State Governments. As the State Government was paying very low salaries, naturally these people were placed at the lowest rung of the ladder. In the Postal and Telegraphs Department thousands of employees of the State with 20 and 25 years of service were given a start on Rs. 60 with the result that all clerks all over India, who were recruited upto 1950 are senior to these people. The cases of other Government departments are also not different. So I would request the hon. Minister of this House to consider a practical way out. Travancore-Cochin State may be considered as a separate zone or as a separate units and promotions within that unit may be given to the officers in that unit itself. That I feel is the only way out of this situation.

Another question which is agitating a section of the people of the State and also of the officers is the integration of services between Travancore and Cochin State employees. My old friend Mr. Iyyunni has been very much agitated over this issue and has gone to the extent of advocating an Advisory regime in the State. But I am sure the Government and this House are aware of the considered

opinion not only of the various political parties in my State but also of the Legislature of the State regarding the question of the applicability or otherwise of article 371 of the Constitution to Travancore-Cochin. We have strongly protested and we do want that article to be taken away in so far as Travancore-Cochin State is concerned. As for Mr. Iyyunni, I would like to inform this House without a suspicion of doubt or dispute that his is the lone voice among a people of 92 lakhs. I admit there is some ground for complaint so far as the proposed categorisation and integration of services are concerned. But Mr. Iyyunni sees only one side of the picture. There is another side to the picture.

There was an order during war time that officers should not be given a permanent lien. The Travancore State observed that order to the very letter and even when the popular Ministry was installed in power, they did not change it before the integration. Nothing was done, so much so, that officers in Travancore State had been under temporary employment getting three or four promotions and yet having their lien on the lowest rung. On the other hand, the Cochin Government, under the clever leadership of Panamballi Govinda Menon: not only confirmed all the officers just on the eve of integration but also gave them double promotions, undesirable promotions. So naturally hundreds of officers in the Travancore State have lost their seniority. But I am not worried about the officers. What I want to say is that the poor staff of the lower rung have been ignored in both States. The poor employees of both States are getting such a low salary that it would be a disgrace to claim them to be servants under the Indian Union.

Another matter which I would like to bring to the notice of the House is that the dearness allowance of pensioners in Cochin is higher than that in Travancore. The Pensioners in Travancore have been agitating and the Travancore-Cochin Government initially gave them some hope. But now they have refused to implement it on the plea of lack of finance. These poor pensioners and the lower grade employees should get some help from the Government and I do not care what happens to the higher services in either Travancore or Cochin.

As to corruption or other charges against the Ministry, I concur fully with my friend Mr. Iyyunni. I also concur with the opinions expressed by Mr. Chacko in this House regard-

ing the greater economic aid to my State. But, I have to record my strong protest to what he said about the Travancore-Cochin High Court (Amendment) Bill. A member of the Praja Socialist Party introduced the Bill in the Travancore-Cochin Legislative Assembly. Then the Government gave the member and the House an assurance that it would be brought to the Centre and proper legislation made. It has been the considered opinion of the Travancore-Cochin Legislature and it has been supported by all the various political parties in the State, and I am astonished to find that a Member of the Congress Party, a Member who ought to be under the discipline of the Congress in his State stood up here to oppose that legislation. (Interruption.) Another Member supported it. I want only to point out to this House one difference regarding the Bill and that is in the original Bill placed before the Legislature, Quilon and Mavelikkara District-Courts were also included within the jurisdiction of the Travandrum Bench of the High Court. They should also be included in the Bill. Then only will it serve the purpose for which it was introduced.

Shri A. M. Thomas (Ernaculam): Why not a Bench of the High Court in each district?

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: You may do whatever you like; I have no objection.

I would also invite the attention of the House to the most important problem that faces the country, especially my State. We are really anxious for an Aikya Kerala. This is the proper time for forming the Kerala province.

Now, I come to the working of the Home Ministry. I find that under Sub-head A and C of Demand No. 52, there are two schemes, one for Training of Central Secretariat officers in Part A States and, the second for Training of Indian Administrative Service Probationers. These cost 1,25,000 and 4,11,600 respectively. Under Sub-head D, there is a Secretariat Training school, claiming 1,14,000. I do not understand why these different institutions should be set up for allied studies, unless it be an application of Apartheid in bureaucracy. I also find that the revised estimates of 1952-53 have not been taken into consideration when the estimates for 1953-54 were prepared. In Demand No. 53, the allotment for 163 officers for 1953-54 is Rs. 1,84,000. I find that for the year 1952-53, the Demand for 163 employees has been only 1,65,000. for ten

[Shri N. Sreekanta Nair]

members of staff whom we are utilising in addition, this year, we are spending only Rs. 19,000 less than what is demanded for next year. As far as Demand No. 54 is concerned, that is Delhi, out of the total of 1,51,00,000, Rs. 1,45,00,000, is taken up by the Police. Together with Demand No. 55, the total amount spent on Police comes to Rs. 2,14,00,000. It is not the expenditure on Police, but it is the police mentality of the administration about which I am worried. Now, the Congress Raj is a Police State. The Damocles sword hangs over the Press and even posters are going to be penalised.

On page three of the Summary of the report, the Government is expressing its glee over the working of the Preventive Detention (Second Amendment) Act, 1952. I know it is not possible and there is no meaning in requesting this House or the Government to rescind that Act. But, I appeal that there may be some uniformity, some kind of elementary justice in the working of this Act in the various States. I come from Travancore Cochin State. I know what the conditions prevailing there are. The situation in Mysore, Hyderabad and Bombay are also no better. The position of the convicts and prisoners in my State is much worse. I would appeal to the Minister and to this House that instead of running after reckless reports and making indefinite promises, some simple reforms may be introduced. We have to put an end to the system of awarding stripes as punishment. We should also allow the prisoners at least the facility of smoking *bidi* and using tobacco. For a bit of tobacco, for a *bidi* prisoners of both sexes in jails all over India are tempted to commit all sorts of unnatural offences, of which we should be ashamed. At least give them this facility so that our conception of hygiene and our conception of morality may be bettered.

Regarding the communalistic disturbances in Kashmir, already the hon. Member Annie Mascarene has referred to that. I feel that we ought to go to the root of the question. I do not agree certainly with the policy of repression that is going on. By this repression you are only going to worsen the conditions which you are fighting to avoid. By this repression, you are enhancing the prestige of these people, the sections which are anti-national, and are really anti-democratic. You are strengthening the hands of the communalists. Unfortunately, that has been the policy of

the Congress in the past as it is today. In the past you fanned the flames of Muslim communalism and attempted to use it as a lever for the national struggle. When things went out of their control, they turned to Hindu communalism and attempted to pacate it. That is why Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee entered the Central Congress Cabinet. Now, when he has gone out, when he has found that the time is favourable to fan the flame of communalism, and play the first fiddle and not the second fiddle to anybody else, naturally you feel that the country is in danger. You are not going to tackle the problem effectively. What is the definite approach that you have for this question? Let us go to the root of the question. I say, 'something is wrong in the State of Denmark'. There is something wrong in the administration of Kashmir. Otherwise, certainly, the movement would not have assumed such mass proportions. Let us send some non-communal representatives from this House to study the question at first hand. Then, let us go to the people and tell them, there have been mistakes, we will rectify them. Let us take the people into confidence. Are you prepared for that? No, it is too much for you. I know you are not prepared to take the people into your confidence. You fear the leftist parties more than you fear the communalists. You are going to hand over the fate of 360 million people to these self-same communalists tomorrow rather than turn and seek the help of the leftist forces in this country.

Another important point that I would like to stress is this. I am referring to the speech of the hon. Home Minister when the question of arrests in Delhi was taken up in this House. Repeated references to the findings of the Supreme Court set up a very bad precedent. The Home Minister was rubbing on the wrong side. It seemed to be in the Mark Antonian refrain in Shakespeare. "And yet, Brutus is an honourable man." In the same strain, the Home Minister repeated *ad nauseam*. "There opinion is law." That I think casts aspersions on the decisions taken by the Supreme Court. I also want to say that the Judges of the Supreme Court should not be lured or misled and we should not throw temptations in the path of the Supreme Court Judges by offering the retired Judges some lucrative posts like that of a Governor.

I have many more things to say. But, as my time is up, I have to close.

श्री राधा रमण (दिल्ली नगर) : सभा-पति जी, कल से आज तक संसद् के बहुत से सदस्यों के भाषण सुनने का मुझे अवसर मिला और यहां पर बहुत सारी बातें होम मिनिस्ट्री और स्टेट्स मिनिस्ट्री के बारे में कही गईं। मैं गृह मंत्री को देश में शान्ति और अमन कायम रखने के लिये सुबारकबाद देना चाहता हूँ। कहने को तो हम सब बहुत बड़ी बड़ी बातें गृह मंत्री और गृह मन्त्रालय के विषय में कह सकते हैं, मगर मुझे दुःख होता है कि इन सदस्यों में ऐसे भी हमारे मित्र हैं कि जो बिना सोचे विचारे हमारे मंत्रियों के कामों पर कड़ी आलोचनाएं कर देते हैं और ऐसे ऐसे सख्त इल्जाम लगा देते हैं कि जिन की बनियाद में कुछ भी नहीं होता कल जब मैं संसद् की एक बहिन मस्करिन जी के विचारों को सुन रहा था तो मुझे बड़ा दुःख हुआ कि एक जिम्मेदार बहिन ने गृह मंत्री के कार्यों पर ऐसी ऐसी आलोचनाएं कीं जिन की हम उन से आशा नहीं कर सकते थे। यह ठीक है और हमारे मंत्री समय समय पर इस बात को मानते हैं कि देश में जो नकशा हम अपने गृहकार्यों का या अपनी सरबिसेज का, सरकारी मुलाजिमों का, और उन के चरित्र का देखा चाहते हैं, वह नकशा हम को अभी तक देखने को नहीं मिला है। हमारे देश में यह बात हम अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं और मानते आये हैं कि कुछ ऐसे करप्शन इत्यादि के मामले आते हैं, मेलएडमिनिस्ट्रेशन (mal-administration) के मामले आते हैं कि जिन को देख कर हमें दुःख होता है और हमारी यह इच्छा होती है कि हम शीघ्रातिशीघ्र उन से नजात पावें। मगर मेरा अपना यह अनुभव है और अपने उस अनुभव की बिना पर मैं तमाम भाइयों और बहनों से जो संसद् के सदस्य हैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि सारी उंगलियां एक सी नहीं हैं। हमारी सरकार के जो मुलाजिम हैं उन में बहुत अच्छे अच्छे व्यक्ति

भी मौजूद हैं और ऐसे आदमी भी मौजूद हैं कि जिन के कामों की वजह से हमें शर्म उठानी पड़ती है। मेरा यह अनुभव हुआ है कि जब कभी भी कोई ऐसा मामला मेरे सामने आया है तो सब से पहले मैंने स्वयं ही उस को खान-बीन की है और उस खान-बीन करने के पश्चात् जब मुझे को यह विश्वास हो गया कि इस में सरकारी मुलाजिम का दोष है तो मैंने उस मामले को उठाया।

5 P.M.

पहले जो मुझे उतर मिला वह बहुत ही निराशाजनक था। जैसे माधारण तौर पर मिला करना है वह मुझे भी मिला, लेकिन जब मैंने पुनः मंत्री महोदय को और उनके सरकारी मुलाजिमों को अपनी जांच के विषय में एक कड़ी चिट्ठी लिखी और मैंने उनको बताया कि हम लोग संसद् में इसलिये नहीं बैठते हैं कि जो कुछ आपके कानों में डाला जाय, उसको आप सुनकर मामूली तौर पर अपने मुलाजिमों के सुपुर्द कर दें और उसका एक साधारण सा उत्तर हमें दे दिया जाय। जब मैंने दुबारा लिखा तो उस पर कुछ कार्यवाही हुई और ऐसे सैंकड़ों केसेज हमारे सामने मौजूद हैं कि जिन के फ़ैसलों से मुझे काफ़ी संतोष हुआ।

अभी चन्द दिन का जिक्र है कि यहां की डिस्ट्रिक्ट जेल के अन्दर एक आदमी काफ़ी सख्त बीमार था और मरने के निकट हो गया था, मैंने दिल्ली की सरकार को लिखा कि एक ऐसे व्यक्ति को जेल में रखना जो कि मृत्यु की षडियां गिन रहा हो और किसी क्षण भी मर सकता हो किसी भी सरकार के लिये उचित बात नहीं है और उसको जेल से रिहा कर देना चाहिये। उसका उत्तर मुझे हस्ब मामूळ निराशाजनक मिला, लेकिन मैं चुप न बैठा और मैंने फिर अधिकारियों को लिखा कि मैं पूरी जांच पड़ताल करके इसी नतीजे पर पहुंचा हूँ कि इस व्यक्ति को छोड़ना ही सरकार के हिज़

[श्री गधा रमण]

में होगा और उस व्यक्ति के भी हित में होगा और मुझे यह कहते हुए खुशी होती है कि मुझे इस कार्य में सफलता मिली और वह व्यक्ति जेल से रिहा कर दिया गया, मगर दुःख केवल इस बात का है कि जो काम फ़ौरन चौबीस घंटे के भीतर २ किया जाना चाहिये था, उसको करने में एक इफ़ता लग गया और वह व्यक्ति केवल २४ या ४८ घंटे तक ही जेल से बाहर आकर जीवित रहा और तत्पश्चात् मर गया ।

इसी तरह एक दूसरा केस मैं आप को बताऊँ कि यहाँ दिल्ली के स्टेशन पर एक औरत को इस बात के लिये बुरी तरह मारा पीटा गया था कि उस पर यह इलजाम था कि उसने चोरी की है लेकिन वह इलजाम वास्तव में सही नहीं था, वह केस जब मेरे सामने आया तो मैंने उसके बारे में सरकार को लिखा और मंत्री जी को भी लिखा जो रेलवे विभाग से सम्बन्ध रखते हैं, वह भी मामला बहुत दिनों तक चलता रहा और पहले तो उसी तरह का एक साधारण उत्तर मुझे को दे दिया गया, लेकिन यह बात जांच करने पर ठीक साबित हो चुकी थी कि उस औरत को बिला किसी वजह के मारा गया है और इतनी जोर से मारा गया है कि उस की चमड़ी तक उधड़ गयी, मैंने फिर उसके बारे में लिखा और कोशिश की और मुझे संतोष है कि मेरे प्रयत्न के फलस्वरूप उस गुलिस इस्पेक्टर को जिसने उस औरत को मारा था वहाँ से हटा दिया गया और उसको सस्पेंड (suspend) कर दिया गया । हमारे भाइयों में यह दोष है कि हम यह चाहते तो हैं कि हमारे देश में से बर्खास्त हटें और देश में सुधार हो और यहाँ के सरकारी मुलाज़िम सही तौर से अपना काम करें, मगर हम बहुत सारी बातें जो उनके मुताल्लिक कहते हैं उनकी अच्छी तरह से जांच पड़ताल नहीं करते और बेबुनियाद

चीजों को लेकर सारे देश के अन्दर चर्चा करते हैं और अपनी सरकार को भ्रष्ट बुरा कहते हैं जिससे न तो हम कोई आनो मंत्रिस करते हैं, न सरकार की खिदमत करते हैं और न मुल्क की ही खिदमत करते हैं । मैं अपने भाइयों और बहिनों से जो इस संघर्ष में काम करते हैं यह निवेदन करना कि उन्हें चाहिये कि वह ऐसे स्पेसिफ़िक (specific) इलजाम जो खास २ उनकी निगाह में आते हैं, उनके बारे में अच्छी तरह जांच पड़ताल और छानबीन करने के बाद सरकार और अधिकारियों के साथ उनके विषय में पत्र व्यवहार करके उन मामलों को निपटावें और उन्हें उनकी आखिरी मंज़िल तक पहुँचावें और मुझे यह विश्वास है कि हमारे मंत्रियों की भी यह बड़ी इच्छा और स्वादिश है कि जो ऐसे केसेज और इलजाम उनके सामने लाये जायें, उनको वह दूर करें ताकि मुल्क के अन्दर तरक्की हो और देश निरन्तर उन्नति के पथ पर अग्रसर हो सके आवश्यकता इस बात की भी है कि यहाँ के सरकारी मुलाज़िम भी अपने कामों और उत्तरदायित्व को अच्छी तरह समझें और निभने का प्रयत्न करें । इसलिए हम सब का यह कर्त्तव्य है कि गृह मंत्रालय के कठिन परिश्रम और लगातार कोशिश से देश के अन्दर जो एक शान्ति और अमन नज़र आती है उसको बनाये रखने के लिये और अपने देश को और मजबूत और उन्नत करने के लिए हम सब मिलकर हमारे सामने की कुशियों पर जो मंत्रिगण बैठे हुए हैं उनके साथ सहयोग करें और उनका हाथ बटायें और इस क्रिस्म की जो बातें और केसेज हमारे नोटिस में आयें, उनकी पहले अच्छी तरह से छानबीन करके मंत्रियों की खिदमत में पेश करें ताकि वह उनको हल करने के लिये और उनके बारे में फ़ैसला देने में ठीक क़दम उठा सकें ।

दूसरी बात जिसकी ओर मैं आपका ध्यान आकर्षित कराना चाहता हूँ और जिसकी बाबत कल भी यहां पर जिक्र किया गया वह है हमारे मुल्क के अन्दर राजप्रमुखों की संस्था है। यह मांग की गई है कि यह राज-प्रमुख और साथ में प्रिवी पर्स की जो प्रथा है यह बहुत जल्द खत्म की जानी चाहिये। मैं उम भावना से जो इन मांग में निहित है, सहमत हूँ कि हमारे देश के अन्दर जो यह राज-प्रमुख की संस्था बनायी गयी और बड़ी २ शैलियां प्रिवी पर्स की उन राजा महाराजाओं को दी गई, यह प्रथा वास्तव में कोई बहुत अच्छी नहीं मालूम पड़ती जब हम उन राजाओं के पिछले कारनामों पर दृष्टिपात करते हैं कि उन राजाओं ने पिछले जमाने में क्या किया। उनके कारनामों और काले इतिहास का स्मरण करके हमारे दिल में जो एक ज्वलन है वह फिर ताजा हो जाता है, मैं इस प्रथा को समाप्त से पूर्णतया सहमत हूँ और हम बराबर आवाज उठाते आये हैं कि यह संस्था बुरी है, इसे फौरन खत्म किया जाना चाहिये, और यह भी सही है कि हम इस प्रथा को जारी रखकर अपने साथ एक अन्याय कर रहे हैं। कोई भी सभ्य समाज इस को जारी रखना नहीं चाहेगा। लेकिन साथ ही हमें यह भी याद रखना चाहिये कि हमारे नेताओं ने उन देशी रियासतों के शासकों से कुछ एग्जीमेंट्स किये हैं और उन एग्जीमेंट्स के फलस्वरूप यह राजप्रमुख संस्था बनी और उनको हमने प्रिवी पर्स देना तय किया। यह होते हुए भी हम चाहते हैं कि यह संस्था और प्रिवी पर्स खत्म हों, तो उसके लिए जरूरत इस बात की है कि हम अपने मुल्क में एक ऐसे समाज का निर्माण करें कि जिस समाज में शोषण बिल्कुल खत्म हो जाय और जिसमें अमीरी बिल्कुल खत्म होजाये, यानि जिन लोगों के पास दौलत है, उसका राष्ट्रीयकरण हो जाय और वह दौलत उन चन्द पूंजीपतियों के पास न रह कर देश की दौलत बन जाय

और जब हम ऐसा करने में सवर्थ होजायेंगे तो आप देखेंगे कि बगैर कहे ही आपका यह काम मुल्क हो जायगा। इसलिए मैं तो आपसे अर्ज करता हूँ कि आप बजाये इस तरह की बातें कह कर उन लोगों को नाराज करें, इन बातों को छोड़कर इस बात को कोशिश करें कि हमारे देश में ये पूंजीवाद का नाश हो।

पार्ट सी स्टेट्स की बाबत हमारे कानों में बराबर यह कहा जाता है कि पार्ट सी० स्टेट्स को पास की दूसरी स्टेट्स के साथ मर्ज (merge) कर देना चाहिये और इस संसद् के बहुत से सदस्यों ने इस हेतु पहले भी बहुत जद्दोजहद की मगर आखिर में संसद् में काफी गौर के बाद यह फैसला किया गया कि सरकार का हर जगह प्रजातन्त्री शासन स्थापित करना फर्ज है और इसलिए पार्ट सी स्टेट्स कायम की गयीं और वहां काम हो रहा है, लेकिन यह बड़े ताज्जुब की बात है कि अभी उनको कार्य करते हुए मुश्किल से एक वर्ष भी नहीं गुजरा है कि उनको मर्ज करने के लिए आवाज सुनी जाने लगी है, मेरी समझ में ऐसी मांग गैर वाजिव और असंगत है। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस संसद् और हम सब लोगों का यह फर्ज है कि हम ने जो फैसला किया है और यह पार्ट सी स्टेट्स को प्रजातन्त्री शासन प्रदान किया है उस पर पाबन्द रहें और इस बात का तजुबा हासिल करें कि हमारा यह प्रयोग कहां तक सफल हुआ है। यह आपको और हमको अच्छी तरह से जानना है कि देश के लिए ही हम जीते हैं और देश के लिए ही हम कुर्बान होना चाहते हैं। विश्वास रखिये कि अगर किसी समय भी हमने ऐसा समझा कि यह पार्ट ए० बी० या सी० स्टेट्स जो हमने बनाई हैं, देश के हित में उन स्टेटों को दूसरी स्टेटों में मर्ज कर देना चाहिये, या हमने ऐसी आवश्यकता महसूस की, तो हम उन्हें मर्ज करने से भी नहीं हिचकेंगे, हमारे सामने देश का हित सर्वोपरि है और सब बात पीछे है।

Mr. Chairman: There are very many hon. Members who anxious to speak, and therefore, I am a bit strict. I would request the hon. Member to bring his remarks to a close.

श्री राधा रमण : अब मैं एक बात सिर्फ और अर्द्ध करूंगा कि मुझे इस बात की बड़ी खुशी है कि हमारे राज्य मंत्री ने इस बात की घोषणा की है कि देहली में पुलिस के सम्बन्ध में एक नई स्कीम जो डेढ़ साल पहले हमारे सामने रखी गई थी, वह स्वीकार कर ली गई है, पहले वह बीच में ही रोक दी गई थी क्योंकि उस स्कीम के सम्बन्ध में स्टैंडिंग कमेटी ने इतराज किया था, अब उसको फिर से चालू किया गया है। दिल्ली शहर में अमनो-अमान कायम रखने के लिए यह बहुत जरूरी हो जाता है कि हम देहली की पुलिस को बहुत ज्यादा मजबूत बनावें ताकि हमारे शहर में जो भी शरारत करने वाली ताकतें हैं और जो शान्ति के लिए गम्भीर खतरा सिद्ध हो रही हैं, उनको दूर रखने और खत्म करने में हमारा पुलिस विभाग सफल हो सके। बातें तो मैं और भी बहुत सी आप से कहना चाहता था, लेकिन वक्त नहीं है। आखिरी बात मैं देहली की जुडीशरी की बाबत कहना चाहूंगा। हमारे देहली के अन्दर जो न्यायालय हैं और न्याय करने की जो मशीनरी है, उसमें न्याय प्राप्त करने में लोगों को काफी देर तक प्रतीक्षा करनी होती है और देर लगने के साथ उनका रूपया भी काफी बर्बाद होता है, इसलिए जरूरत इस बात की है कि ऐसा प्रबन्ध किया जाय ताकि हमारे यहाँ न्याय जल्दी और सस्ता हो, और आज जो पब्लिक के अन्दर एक तरह का भाव है कि अदालतों के अन्दर पूरी तरह से इनसाफ नहीं मिलता है, वह दूर करने का प्रयत्न किया जाय।

इस मामले में भी आप ने एक स्कीम मंजूर कर ली है और वह यह है कि न सिर्फ एक सूब से ही वरन दूसरे सूबों से भी जजेज बुलाये

जायें। मैं यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि यह बहुत जरूरी है। मगर आप जब दूसरे सूबों से जजेज बुलाते हैं तो उस में इतने अच्छे टैलेन्ट्स नहीं आ सकते क्योंकि वह लोग अपने अच्छे आदमियों को नहीं भेजते। आज दिल्ली के अन्दर ऐसे वकील मौजूद हैं जिन की खिद-मात इस मामले में हासिल की जा सकती हैं।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं यह उम्मीद करूंगा कि हमारे राज्यों के मंत्री इन दो तीन बातों पर गौर करेंगे जो मैं ने आप के सामने रखी हैं और कायदों के अन्दर ऐसा मुधार करेंगे जिस से यहाँ की जनता को कुछ आराम हासिल हो सके।

Dr. Lanka Sundaram (Visakhapatnam): I have, despite illness, decided to intervene in this debate, as a result of a statement made yesterday by my hon. friend Swami Ramananda Tirtha, in the course of which he made a reference to me and my attitude to the problems of Hyderabad. He said that I am free lancer, and as such apparently he tried to imply that I can run helter-skelter in regard to my views with reference to the fortunes of his State. I submit that my hon. friend Swami Ramananda Tirtha has been less than fair to me either personally or in my capacity as the President of the All India Linguistic States Conference. Everybody in this House and also outside knows the remorselessly consistent manner in which I individually, and in my capacity as the president of the organisation for the linguistic division of the country have declared that there is no alternative to the immediate dismemberment of the Hyderabad State, accompanied by the deposition of the Nizam who is now called the Rajpramukh. If my hon. friend Swami Ramananda Tirtha has any more doubts about it—I dare say he knows it himself personally—very soon we are coming to his own city, where our All-India conference is scheduled to meet. Actually, it is not I who is a free lancer, but my hon. friend opposite. I know something about the affairs of the Hyderabad State Congress; long before the police action, it was my house in New Delhi which was the heaven of the Hyderabad State Congress, which had then no friends. My hon. friend knows also that I was co-opted as a

member of the committee of action of the Hyderabad State Congress, long, long before the police action. Here I have noted down how the freelancing effect is not on me, but on the opposite side. I know my hon. friend Swami Ramananda Tirtha is very fond of a particular colour, saffron, but his saffron assumes the multi coloured phase of a rainbow. When it is exposed to the glare of positional politics. Before the police action, Swami and some of his colleagues, along with some of us who did not belong to the State, but who were anxious to hasten the freedom movement in that State, and incidentally also the freedom movement in this country, were completely and irrevocably committed to the disintegration of the Hyderabad State as well as the deposition of the Nizam. In fact, my hon. friend presided over the Nizamabad session of the State Congress in 1950...

Swami Ramananda Tirtha (Gulberga): I did not preside over that.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: You were the mainspring, as the president of the Hyderabad State Congress. With the blare of trumpets, this very same idea of the disintegration of the State, and the deposition of the Nizam was presented to the public as a platform of action which could not be delayed any further. Actually, recently after the Nanalnagar session of the All India Congress; my hon. friend Swami Ramananda Tirtha retired to Bombay for a few days, from where he issued a statement favouring the deposition of the Rajpramukh and the disintegration of the State. But here I find that he has been obliged to change his tune. I regret to say, but I do say, in all fairness to my hon. friend Swami Ramananda Tirtha that he is now trying to ride three horses at a time, not one—(i) his own State Congress (ii) the Ministry in his own State; and (iii) the States Ministry of the Government of India here. Otherwise I would not have expected from him the statement he made yesterday wherein he said that he believes in counsellors and so he wants counsellors for Part B States. I would not pursue any further my personal parley, if any—I am sure, I have none on my side—with my hon. friend Swami Ramananda Tirtha.

Coming to the basic points, I must say that something has been done at the highest level, both in Delhi and in Hyderabad, to frustrate the movements for the dismemberment of the Hyderabad State and the deposition of the Rajpramukh. I regret to say this, but I have to say it in this connection. I do not wish to go into the

possible reasons behind this change of front but I am here to say without any fear of contradiction, that nothing can hope to stop the movement for the dismemberment of the Hyderabad State. It is time they understood the position. In view of the fact that the Andhra State is coming into being any moment, the repercussions of the creation of the new Andhra State will be felt immediately in Hyderabad, and I would therefore urge that the disintegration should take place without passion or prejudice and without any commotion, because I am most anxious that this country's administrative machinery, and the administrative system must be completely reorganised without the least possible friction or irritation to anybody.

Having said this, I would like to turn my attention to the Home Ministry and its activities described in the annual report placed before us. As I was listening to the progress of the debate yesterday, I almost felt that my hon. friend the Home Minister was blushing almost like a bride, really, at the uncalled for encomiums which were sought to be paid to him, as regards the administration of the Home Ministry. In fact, some Members likened it to *Ram Rajya* and so on. But I may present to him a quotation from one of the papers in the country, a friend of the Congress, the *Hindu* of Madras, dated the 28th inst., tant with reference to the debate which took place the other day, on the 25th of this month, in this House. This is what it says:

"In so far these findings of the Supreme Court constitute a reflection on the general conduct of persons possessed of powers over the liberties of the citizen, it is a matter which should be the concern of Parliament, may be, in a different form from that in which it comes up before the judiciary..... Now, having regard to the clear finding of the Supreme Court about the illegality of the detention and certain other serious irregularities of procedure noted by their Lordships, one would have thought that the Government would have taken the opportunity to express their regret for the conduct of the officers concerned, and to give an assurance of its non-recurrence."

As regards the attitude taken up by the hon. Minister, the paper adds:

"It would be disastrous (but not surprising) even if a few executive officers interpreted..... some of his own statements in the House, as being tantamount to a condonation of official breaches of the

[Dr. Lanka Sundaram]

Constitution relating to Fundamental Rights of the individual."

After all, what did the Supreme Court say? Unfortunately, the most important portion of their judgment was not mentioned by any of my colleagues, and so I would like to quote from the judgement of the Supreme Court:

"This Court has often reiterated before that those who feel called upon to deprive other persons of their personal liberty, in the discharge of what they conceive to be their duty, must strictly and scrupulously observe the forms and rules of law. That has not been done in this case. The petitioners now before us are therefore....."

Dr. Katju: Was this addressed to the magistrate?

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: The magistrate is under your control, and it is your responsibility, as far as this House is concerned.

Dr. Katju: I am not responsible for the magistrate, in his judicial capacity.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: My hon. friend has a very easy way of dealing with problems of this fundamental character. The point I am trying to make is this, that there must be a sense of security in the mind of the individual, that the law will be properly interpreted, and will be on his side and not against him.

Mr. Chairman: May I ask the hon. Member whether he wants that the executive should interfere with the judiciary.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: Sir, that is a legal argument, which I need not possibly expand beyond a certain point, as stated in the judgment of the Supreme Court, that instead of expressing regret for what has happened.....

Dr. Katju: But what have I done for which I should express regret?

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: There you are.

Dr. Katju: How can I express regret for something that I have not done?

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: I leave the point at that, because we will have further occasions to refer to it, when

the review of the Preventive Detention Act comes up before the House very soon.

I now want to address myself for a few seconds to the problems of the Home Ministry. I would like, with your permission, Sir, to direct the attention of the House to the responsibility of the Home Ministry in regard to their employment policies, and their policies with regard to the rights of employees, not only of the Central Government and quasi-Central Government employees, but by implication, employees all over the country. The Government of India today is perhaps—why 'perhaps'—actually—the biggest employer. Anything between 25 and 30 lakhs of people are involved—either in direct employment or in quasi-employment, and so on and so forth. The country looks up to the Home Ministry for the laying down and the carrying out of rules and regulations intended for the protection of the rights of these workers. I am not going to speak about trade unionism today, but I am referring to a matter of very vital importance. Since the past few days I have been rather worried about the manner in which the 'law and order' situation, as claimed normally by my hon. friend, Dr. Katju, has arisen out of the dissatisfaction and irritation inherent in the lack of a consistent and fair-minded policy towards employees in general. Everywhere today in this country there is retrenchment under the plea of rationalisation—jute, tea, coal-fields and so on and so forth. Why, today at this very moment at Vishakhapatnam 813 people have been discharged summarily from service from the shipyard—the shipyard for which the responsibility is that of the Government of India. I am making a reference to it, Sir, with your permission. I hope the House will bear with me if I make one point, namely, that everywhere the Government of India in the position of employer is short-circuiting the laws of the land, in order to create special situations. I will explain. Yesterday a notice was served on the workers asking them peremptorily to get out of the shipyard. Normally 14 days' notice is given—time notice. But now they are offered cash payment in lieu of notice. They are turned out. And how are they turned out? Section 144 is to be declared and the entire military might of the Government put behind the shipyard, and so on and so forth. Now, the House will agree with me that this is a way in which not only the rights of workers are side-tracked and stabbed from behind,

but situations involving law and order are created. In other words, if they had been given 14 days' notice they would have the right to approach the arbitration and conciliation machinery available in this country. A reference could have been made to the Labour Commissioner, Madras. An Adjudication Tribunal could have been set up. In situations of this character, workers are prevented from enjoying the rights they are entitled under the law of the land. If any incidents happen on account of ignorance or irritation, then the heavy arm of the law would come upon them, and my hon. friend, Dr. Katju, would stand up and say: 'It is a law and order situation'.

I am most anxious that my hon. friend should order a review of the manner in which the rights of workers and their terms and conditions of service are being regulated under the various Government departments, the manner in which recognition is granted or not granted to trade unions—because the rights of collective bargaining, of association and combination, are always there without which the relationship between the employer and the employed, as far as the Government of India is concerned, cannot be regulated. I do hope that this constructive suggestion I am placing before the House will be looked into by my hon. friend, and that he will take steps to see that there is one set of uniform conditions for all categories of workers.

In the annual report of the Home Ministry there is a paragraph—I dare say you must have seen it—which says that there are separate rules provided for the Railway Ministry employing one million workers in this country. Why should it be so? Why these different rules? The Home Ministry is responsible for the country as a whole. I do hope my hon. friend will look into this.

One final word, Sir. I want to make a brief reference to the Scheduled Castes and Tribes of—shall I say Andhra Desa—of Dandakaranya—a part of my constituency, about which not much has been heard in this House. It is only fair that I should raise my little voice here in favour of some attention being devoted to the Scheduled Tribes people of the Agencies of the Godavari and Visakhapatnam districts. I know the annual report of the Commissioner will come before us. I am prepared to wait till then, but what I am trying to say is that 600,000 people in this hinterland of India, which is the belly of this country, are completely neglected. I would suggest that Mr. Srikant may

go there. My hon. friend, the Minister himself may go there and establish contact with one particular portion of the country which is completely 'black', in the sense that nobody has so far attempted to enter it, because it is most inaccessible and is neglected. This plea I make because I feel that there should be no 'black' and 'white' patches in this country as regards the policy towards the Scheduled Castes and Tribes. I also say this because I belong to a double-member constituency, and I am elected also by the Adivasis.

Dr. Krishnaswami (Kancheepuram): Sir, may I make a personal appeal at the outset to my hon. friends opposite and to the Minister for Parliamentary Affairs in particular? We have been witnessing debates on the various cut-motions for the past few days and the one feeling which has sprung uppermost in the minds of many of us in the Opposition is that we obtain no replies to the queries raised by us, that we have general references to all things under the sun, without any special reference to the particular subject under review. It is a matter for regret that Parliamentary debate, to which very great importance is attached in a democracy, and more particularly in an infant democracy becomes futile—precisely because my hon. friends—I make this charge in all humility and seriousness, do not take their duties seriously.

This apart, let me advert to the administration of the Ministry of Home Affairs and States. I address my remarks directly to the Minister for Home Affairs and States because I feel that the Ministry under his charge occupies a pivotal position in the country's set-up. So far as I can make out, up to the present, the Government in considering the great issues—the issues of civil liberty, the administrative reorganisation of States and the partition of the South—has not displayed anything like a sense of responsibility. There has been considerable shilly-shallying and dilly-dallying with these manifestly important problems. I do not propose to make a detailed reference to civil liberties in our country, partly because I do not have the time to deal with them at length. Moreover this House will be called upon to review the whole question of preventive detention and civil liberties sometime later in November when we will have probably a great opportunity to make a detailed and searching inquiry into the various sins of omission and commission of our Home Ministry. The Home Minister points out that we will have only one day; but even one day would be enough to bring to the notice

[Dr. Krishnaswami]

of our people all the various infringements on civil liberty that have been committed by the Government. But there is one incident which cannot be ignored and which, I hope the Home Minister would particularly take note of, and furnish us let me hope a satisfactory reply.

My hon. friend, Dr. Lanka Sundaram, in the course of his speech pointed out that the unlawful detention of three hon. Members of this Parliament was dealt with by the Government in a cavalier fashion. I entirely agree with him that this issue was not properly considered. My hon. friend, the Home Minister, in the course of his reply on a previous occasion on this subject and in the course of various interjections during Dr. Lanka Sundaram's speech, in a spirit of levity said that he was not responsible for controlling the judiciary, that the errors of the subordinate judiciary were bound to be corrected by the superior judiciary. But I would like to point out that while the law protects judicial officers including Magistrates from liability to persons injured even by grievously or manifestly wrong orders passed by them, there is a responsibility which the Executive has to the injured citizen. Reparation for injury which has been done is the manifest duty of the State and the Executive. I would like to bring to the notice of my hon. friend a very important case which figured large in the Law reports of the United Kingdom—the case of Adolf Beck who had been sent to prison not because the Magistrate or the Judge did not know what the law was but because there was a misapprehension of the facts of the case.

There was gross miscarriage of justice but the Home Minister in the House of Commons got up and made a handsome apology for what had occurred. It did not follow that by so doing he was controlling the judiciary. What is required of a civilised Government is an expression of regret for any injury that might be inflicted on an individual. Where a wrong is committed by a private individual, no one can seriously complain against the Government because the law allows him full scope for redress. But where the injury is inflicted by a State agency acting in the exercise of official authority, the position is manifestly different. And, if the State agency interferes, in addition, with the fundamental rights of the citizen, as in the case of these three hon. Members of Parliament, who were

prevented from discharging their duties, the well-being and welfare of the community is involved. I was, therefore, surprised when my hon. friend, in reply to the debate did not consider it proper to indulge in an expression of regret for the injury that had been inflicted. While he spoke, he was speaking as though it was merely a case of the inferior judiciary being corrected by the superior judiciary. Every tyro knows that the subordinate judiciary is bound to be corrected by the superior judiciary. In fact, we lawyers, whenever we frame our grounds of appeal begin with the plea that the lower court has acted erroneously and pray the High court to interfere on behalf of our client. But, there is a duty on the part of the Executive, especially where there has been an infringement of a fundamental right and where hon. Members have been prevented from discharging their Parliamentary duties to express gracefully regret, to make reparation for the injury done and by expressing regret indicate to the Magistracy that in future at least such errors will not be acquiesced in and that they ought to be more careful in their interpretation of our guaranteed rights.

Having disposed of this matter, let me advert to the question of partition of the South. My hon. friend knows and it is now common knowledge that we decided to cross the rubicon in December last when the Prime Minister made his famous declaration of policy on the constitution of the Andhra State. I should have thought that the Home Ministry, the moment that declaration was made, would take certain consequential steps and would have had those steps implemented before it thought of an enquiry being conducted by the Chief Justice of the Rajasthan High Court. As it is, the position as it emerged is extremely difficult for common people like myself to understand. The Chief Justice of Rajasthan was deputed to make a roving enquiry into financial, political and social problems without any definite decision being taken on political issue by the Government. What, for instance, was the meaning of having a tedious and irritating discussion on whether Madras should be the temporary capital of Andhra when you had not taken steps, or rather when you had not even envisaged the steps to be taken regarding fixation of a permanent capital for the new Andhra State. As a result of your not having made clear your intentions, as a result of your not having a settled policy, what happened was that the citizens of the

residuary State obtained the impression, perhaps justifiably, that a temporary capital would, as in Wonderland mean a permanent capital. A great deal of heat and passion was generated, heat and passion which we all regret and which, many of us tried our best to calm but which was rendered impossible because the Union Government had not understood its responsibilities properly. I am sorry to have to speak in this strain, but feeling as I do strongly I must point out that the approach to the problem of partition of the South was and is completely wrong. In the first place we ought to understand that the partition of a State stands on a different footing from the partition of India and Pakistan. Whereas in the present case, we envisage these two States being units of the Indian Union in the case of partition of India and Pakistan we visualised the creation of two sovereign States. Consequently, when we make an inventory of the assets and liabilities in the two units of the Union, our approach is bound to be different. What has been the attitude of our Government? By not having thought-out these matters clearly, not having clarified your position, all sorts of controversies have been allowed to crop up, and as a result of such controversies arising, the House knows that the South today is nothing else but a House divided against itself, and I go further and charge the Union Government with being interested deliberately in promoting feelings of hatred, disruption, and disunity in the South. (Interruption.) I am glad that I have been interrupted because this gives me an opportunity for elaborating the thesis which I propounded elsewhere that the Home Ministry has been responsible for promoting disruption and disunity in the South. What would you expect—and this is a point which I wish to put before my hon. friend, the Home Minister—what would you expect my hon. friend to do when a State is being partitioned? When a State is partitioned, I should have thought that the Home Minister would follow the precedents set up by those who previously created new States out of old States within the Union. This division of States is nothing new. Sind and Orissa, for instance, were separated. But, we know how exactly the assets and liabilities were divided then. Section 55(2) of the Government of India Act, 1935, has laid with unsurpassed clarity the principle on which the assets and liabilities should be divided as between the residuary State and the new State. You may choose to ignore you may

30 PSD

choose to say that you will not accept them into precedents; but, at any rate, here is a principle which we have to take into account. Instead of that we had infructuous discussions about how much compensation should be paid, and how the compensation should be extracted and what principle should be evolved in finding out who should pay compensation. The duty of the Union Government is clear. Once it is decided to form a new State, it is its responsibility to provide the new State with finances; it is its duty to see that the new State is put on its feet; it is its duty to give the new State sufficient oxygen so that it may survive, and not pass the baby on to the residuary State of Madras already impoverished by division. Have you fulfilled your duty?

In the Budget which was introduced some weeks ago, no provision has been made for the capital expenditure to be incurred by the new State in building a capital. In the later statement made by the Prime Minister there is no reference to anything like 'a permanent capital'. There is only a reference to a temporary capital and all that we are told is that the financial consequences of such location would be examined later on. What I should have wished for and what many of us in the South devoutly wish for is an outright declaration of policy of how you are going to stabilise the new State and its near neighbour the residuary State of Madras. After all the Madras State is a neighbour of Andhra Desa and, in the long run, we have to live in amity with the new Andhra State. I realise that unless and until the Union Government plays the game fairly, there is a chance of bad blood developing and all our relations becoming more embittered. It is a prospect which I do not view with equanimity. But, what the attitude of the Union Government and the Ministry for Home Affairs, in particular is. I have not been able to make out at all because from the Prime Minister's statement one does not know where we are and all that we have obtained from it is soft words. Soft words do not butter parsnips. A solvent and stable new Andhra State is a matter of prime importance to citizens of the residuary State of Madras, because we have to live together and promote ultimately the unity of the South which is something we have to treasure and cherish if we are to prosper. I repeat that by its policy of shilly-shallying and dilly-dallying, we have had the whole State divided, not only geographically but even psychologically and it would take

[Dr. Krishnaswami]

years of patient toil and statesmanship before a Union of hearts emerges. We may if we are wise take revenge on the Union by bringing home to the minds of our people the essential lack of humanity displayed by this Government in its treatment of these grave problems. Give the new Andhra State and the residuary Madras State a chance to live together in amity. Give the Andhra State chance to prosper. Do not try to make it a failure, and thus act in a way which is detrimental to the fundamental interests of the South. I am sorry to have to speak in this strain, but I have always found—and I hope I am not hard on the Home Minister—I have always found him taking up an attitude of extreme *laissez-faire*, an attitude of extreme indifference.

Dr. Katju: Against whom, and about what?

Dr. Krishnaswami: Towards all these problems.

Dr. Katju: I leave it to you to decide for yourself.

Dr. Krishnaswami: We cannot decide for ourselves because the two States have to be units of the Union and the Union Government has to play a dominant part. As a matter of fact, if it had been a case of our deciding by ourselves, the enunciation of the new policy by the Prime Minister in December need not have been made: the new policy was a revision of the old. The Prime Minister's statement gave us the definite indication that you would go ahead with the formation of the Andhra State, whether there was agreement between the citizens of the residuary State of Madras and the Andhras or not. Therefore, it is up to you to live up fully to your responsibilities and to give the new Andhra State such sources of revenue as you can immediately spare and such other sources later as will make it stable. There is no use of saying, "Oh, There is a Five Year Plan in the offing." If realities are to be taken into account, if fairness and justice are to motivate your actions, the peace and stability of peninsular India, of the residuary State of Madras and Andhra, must be considered to be more important than the fulfilment of a Five Year Plan which confers if at all only remote benefits on the South.

Shri G. H. Deshpande (Nasik—Central): I rise to support the Demands placed before the House on behalf of the Home and States Ministries, and I do so wholeheartedly. Generally

speaking, during the last year the affairs of the Home and States Ministries have been handled very satisfactorily. Throughout the country, inspite of repeated efforts for unnecessary provocations, peace has prevailed, and for this our thanks are not only due to the Ministers or the officers concerned in the Department, but our thanks are mainly due to the people in the entire country for the way in which they have behaved. They had to pass through difficult times, but they have realised the importance of observing peace. They were disturbed by many problems which could not be solved all of a sudden or within a short time, but yet, as I have said, inspite of provocations our people have behaved very nicely. A sense of responsibility has grown up, and this is a very good augury for our prosperous future.

There have been attacks in this House since yesterday on the services and the manner in which they are discharging their duties. I do not want to say that our services are perfect, or that there is no scope for improvement, or that they might not have committed mistakes.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: Then what do you say?

Shri G. H. Deshpande: I would tell my hon. friend that he laughs best who laughs last. I will presently tell the Opposition Members what I do want to say. Let them compare the work that has been done by our services during the last five years with the work done by officers in any other country in Asia. They might have committed mistakes, but generally speaking they have stood the test. Our thanks are due to them for our being where we are. I have no doubt that a change has come over them. Only yesterday, a certain officer was named, who I learn now is the Commissioner in Tripura and Manipur. The same gentleman was the Collector of my district for two or three years and from my personal knowledge I know with what efficiency, with what sincerity, and with what patriotism he was working. He functioned in my district on momentous occasions when things were disturbed throughout India. He preserved peace; he preserved tranquillity; he worked as a patriot. I cannot imagine how he might have changed now. People simply want to make capital by such criticism. That is why in season and out of season they go on criticising the officers. It is no use running down the officers as a class. After all, they are also sons of the

soil. It is not as if you can bring meritorious people from outside and substitute them immediately for officers in service. It is not that they are the only sinful people, so you get them out and replace them with very good officers. If they have drawbacks, the drawbacks are there in the country itself. If you want to raise the standard of morality of the services, that can only come about when the general standard of morality in the country as a whole improves. While I agree that there is scope for improvement, I think that the Home Ministry is discharging its duties in this respect very properly. Only this morning, reference was made as to how things are being done. So, I will not go into it.

Now, as regards Part C States, if you will cast a cursory glance over the small pamphlet that has been distributed to us, you will find that tremendous efforts have been made for the welfare activities in these States. An attempt is being made to establish law and order there, to give impetus to the nation-building activities there, to bring them in line with the other parts of the country, and so on. I have no doubt that in future, all these small pockets in India will come up to the standard of the rest of the country and there would be no need for maintaining these Part C States. They will be merged with the adjoining States. If we carry on our work with patience and in the way we are doing now, very soon there will be no necessity for maintaining these Part C States.

I have heard a lot of criticism in this House regarding the way in which the question of the backward classes, the scheduled castes and the scheduled tribes is being handled. I come from a district where nearly 25 per cent. of the population consists of scheduled castes and tribes. No doubt, much has to be done. But it does not mean that little has been done. Let us think of the Harijans. Are they the same as they were twenty-five years ago? Is the lot of the aboriginal tribes the same as some years before? Is the lot of the scheduled tribes the same as some years before? Tremendous changes have been made.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: Their condition is worse.

Shri G. H. Deshpande: Economical, socially and educationally great progress has been made.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: In every respect they are worse.

Mr. Chairman: Let him proceed.

Shri G. H. Deshpande: I would ask my hon. friends to read what has been done for these people. If there are people who having eyes refuse to see, who having ears will not hear, who having brains refuse to understand, I have nothing to say. But as far as the scheduled castes and tribes are concerned, considerable improvement has come about. I am very well acquainted with the situation in the Bombay State. If you will read the report about the progress of the backward classes in Bombay State, you will find that great progress has been made so far as education is concerned. So far as social status is concerned, these people are much better off. They are quite free from the clutches of the *sahukars* and *zamindars*. They are not required to pay very heavy land rent. Government is there, always trying to help them. Educationally, great progress has been made. Free boarding houses have been established. Not only is primary education given to them free of charge, even secondary education in Bombay is given to them free of charge. Not only is it free of charge in the schools, but even in colleges, education is given to them free of charge. Government has started hostels for them, and there is not a single district in Bombay where Government are not maintaining a hostel. All these things must be seen in order to understand how progress is being made. There are people who want to ignore all these things. They want to spread a counsel of despair among the public. They always minimise the achievements. It is done with a motive. They do not want to see that people should realise these things and consolidate and improve India. If conditions improve, they will have to close their shop. That is what is before them. That is why all these efforts are being belittled by them.

Then I would like to say one thing. So far as these tribes are concerned, so far as the scheduled caste people and scheduled tribes are concerned, I have no doubt that something more ought to be done. But look at the attitude that my hon. friend Mr. Rajabhoj takes! When we throw open wells for Harijans they advise their people not to go there; when we open schools they advise their fellow caste people not to attend them. They advise the Harijans not to associate themselves with so called caste Hindus, because if untouchability is removed, whose leaders will they be? They will be unemployed. There are some people, who if there

[Shri G. H. Deshpande]

are no strikes in India, will be unemployed. I say this with a sense of responsibility. I have seen many times strikes being organised without any economic reason, to the detriment of the interests of the general masses of labour.

So I want to say that the Home Department and the States Department during the year under consideration have discharged their duties excellently well. There is some scope for improvement, but they are proceeding on sound lines and that is why I say I support the Demands.

श्रीमती मणिबेन पटेल (कैरा दक्षिण):

चेन्नरमन साहब, कल शाम को और आज जो आबू के बारे में जिक्र हुआ है उसी कारण से मुझे आज बोलने के लिये खड़ा होना पड़ा है, नहीं तो पहले मैं ने इस बहस में शरीक होने की बात नहीं सोची थी।

बहुत सी स्टेटों से मेरा कुछ न कुछ सम्बन्ध रहा है। हमने स्वतंत्रता प्राप्त की, उस के पहले और बाद में अलग अलग स्टेटों के मामले समय समय पर किस तरह से हल किये गये हैं उस का जितना तजुर्बा मुझे है, शायद ही इस हाउस में किसी को होगा। सभी देशी राज्यों का विलीनीकरण, सारे देश का ख्याल करके और लोगों के हित का ख्याल कर के किया गया था। तो क्या सिरोही स्टेट के बारे में यह नहीं सोचा गया होगा? इस छोटी सी स्टेट के मामले में दूसरा ख्याल रखने की बात कहना क्या सही बात है? सरकार की तरफ से सिरोही का मामला किस प्रकार से हल किया गया है उस का पूरा चित्र कभो यहाँ नहीं रखा गया है। मुझे एक एक कदम की पूरी जानकारी है। एक दलील यह भी दी गई कि सन् १९५० तक सिरोही स्टेट को नहीं मिलाया गया और विधान के पास होने के अगले ही दिन मिला लिया गया? १९५० के पहले स्वयम् गोकुल भाई

के आग्रह से नहीं मिलाया गया था। उन्होंने सन् १९५० में कहा था कि उस के मिलाने से राजस्थान में उन की स्थिति मुश्किल हो जायेगी। इसलिए पहले मध्यस्त सरकार की तरफ से सिरोही स्टेट को, बम्बई स्टेट में चलने दिया जाय। और आगे चल कर मिलाया जाय। इस प्रकार भी कहा गया है कि जबर्दस्ती सिरोही को काटा गया और कुछ हिस्सा राजस्थान में और कुछ हिस्सा बम्बई में मिलाया गया है। यह बात भी ठीक नहीं है। गोकुल भाई उन दिन सिरोही के प्रतिनिधि थे और जैसे सब स्टेटों के मामले उन के प्रतिनिधियों को ले कर हल किये गये थे उसी तरह सिरोही के मामले में गोकुल भाई को साथ लिया गया था, और जब सिरोही स्टेट के बारे में बम्बई स्टेट के साथ बहस हुई तो गोकुल भाई और स्टेट मिनिस्ट्री के एक आफिसर, बम्बई गये थे, उन्होंने बम्बई के आफसरों के साथ मशवरा किया और गोकुल भाई स्वयम् सिरोही का नक्शा ले गये थे। जिसमें डिमार्केशन लाइन (demarcation line) खुदने की थी कि किस प्रकार से कौन सा भाग बम्बई स्टेट में मिलाया जाय और कौन सा भाग राजस्थान में मिलाया जाय। इस की काफ़ी चर्चा हुई और बाद में यहाँ आ कर उन्होंने यानो गोकुल भाई ने सरकार के पास रिपोर्ट का कि उन्होंने क्या क्या किया है। बात तो यह है कि जयपुर कांग्रेस के पहिले सिरोही को बम्बई में मिलाने का विचार था परन्तु गोकुल भाई स्वागत समिति के चेन्नरमन थे। उन्होंने और राजस्थान के कार्यकर्त्ताओं ने यह कहा कि आज अगर सिरोही बम्बई स्टेट में मिलाया जायगा तो हमारा काम मुश्किल हो जायेगा। हमें दूसरा स्वागताध्यक्ष चुनना पड़ेगा। इसलिए उस वक्त वह काम नहीं

किया गया था। यह दुःख की बात है कि इस सब बात में गोकुल भाई शरीक थे फिर भी सब चीजों से इन्कार करते हैं। ऐसी हालत में क्या किया जाये। गुजरात प्रदेश समिति ने आबू के बारे में जो प्रस्ताव पास कर के सरकार के पास भेजा है उसमें से थोड़ा सा भाग मैं आप के सामने पढ़ कर सुनाना चाहती हूँ, सारा पढ़ कर मैं आप का समय नहीं लेना चाहती :

"The G.P.C.C. wisely did not protest when areas which must have been legitimately included in Gujrat were placed in other States at the time when different areas were included in various States because it felt that the situation of the country and the unity of India were of primary importance. The G.P.C.C. did not make any demands nor did agitate for them. But when Rajasthan has started an agitation for the Abu area and carries it on so furiously, the G.P.C.C. strongly declares its claims for Dungarpur, Banswada and such other areas which have been included in Rajasthan. The people of some of these areas have, in fact, passed resolutions asking for merger with Bombay State.

This Committee, therefore, requests, the Central Government not to reopen this question as it would be unwise to do so. If, however, it is reopened the evil effects of such an unwise step will not remain confined to the Abu Area only but will spread to the people of other States, and will create bitterness and tension all over.

If in spite of these considerations, the question is to be reopened a Commission for the demarcation of the boundaries of the Bombay and Rajasthan States should be appointed. That Commission should allow an opportunity for presentation of Bombay State's claims regarding the Gujarat areas."

गोकुल भाई बार बार आबू जाते हैं और लोगों के अन्दर वैमनस्य पैदा करने की बातें करते हैं। राजस्थान के प्रधान

भी वहाँ जाते हैं, वह बंबई स्टेट के खिलाफ प्रचार करते हैं अगर बम्बई स्टेट के प्रधान डूंगरपुर और बसवारा वगैरह जगहों में जा कर राजस्थान सरकार के विरुद्ध मीटिंग करें तो राजस्थान को कैसा लगेगा।

डूंगरपुर और बसवारा वगैरह से गुजरात कांग्रेस कमेटी के पास और स्टेट मिनिस्ट्री के पास चिट्ठियाँ तथा तार आए हैं कि वे बम्बई स्टेट में मिलना चाहते हैं। आज मध्य भारत सरोज मांगता है, वह मध्य भारत के बीच में पड़ा है। राजस्थान क्यों नहीं देगा? कल एक भाई ने कहा कि भांसी डिवीजन के कुछ गांव बुंदेलखंडी हैं इसलिये वे विन्ध्य प्रदेश को दिए जाने चाहियें। इसलिये मैं सरकार से कहती हूँ कि जब रिडिस्ट्रीब्यूशन आफ ब्राउन्डीज (re-distribution of boundaries) को लिया जाय तब यह सब प्रश्न उठाए जाने चाहियें।

दूसरी बात यह है कि कल यहाँ राजाओं की प्राइवेट प्रापर्टी का जिक्र हुआ था, और यह भी कहा गया कि यह सब भगड़ा राउन्ड दि टेबल (round the table) बैठ कर तय किया गया था। यह ठीक नहीं है। मुझे हर एक बात मालूम है कि कैसे यह सब बात तय की गई थी। राजाओं से पहिले लिस्ट (list) मांगी, उसे चैक (check) करके मिनिस्ट्रा का भेजा। सब जगह करीब पापुलर मिनिस्ट्री थीं। उस के बाद चर्चा करके बात तय की गयी। बात तो यह है कि अक्सर पापुलर रिप्रेजेन्टेटिव्स राजाओं को जितना देना चाहते थे, स्टेट्स मिनिस्ट्री ने उस से कम दिया है। आज भी मुझे मालूम है कि कई स्टेटों के अन्दर कोई कोई मिनिस्टर राजाओं को ज्यादा देना चाहते हैं। आज

[श्रीमती मणिबेन पटेल]

यह कहना कि सरकार ने उन को ज्यादा दिया है यह बिलकुल गलत बात है ।

यहां प्रिविलेज (privileges) के बारे में जिक्र किया गया था कि हम को मालूम नहीं है कि प्रिविलेजेज का क्या मतलब है । सही बात तो यह है कि अगर आप व्हाइट पेपर को पढ़िये तो उस में सब कुछ दिया गया है कि किस को क्या प्रिविलेजेज हैं ।

प्रीवि पर्स (privy purse) की बात भी कही गई है । करीब २८१ में से १८६ ऐसे हैं जिन को ज्यादा से ज्यादा एक लाख और कम से कम दस दीया जाता है ।

6 P. M.

ज्यादातर तो इस में वे हैं जो कि विधवा है और जो स्त्रियां हैं और उन्हें उनके लाइफ टाइम (life time) तक ही देना है ।

सी० क्लास स्टेट्स ('C' class states) का खर्चा करीब पांच या साढ़े पांच करोड़ प्रति वर्ष है । आज के सैट अप के कारण वह आगे बढ़ता ही जायगा । मैं तो सरकार से यह कहूंगी कि इन सी० क्लास स्टेट्स को वह बगल की स्टेटों में मिला दें और जो यह साढ़े पांच करोड़ रुपया उन पर खर्च किया जाता है वह रुपया उन लोगों की उन्नति पर खर्च किया जाये ।

आज राजाओं की प्रीवि पर्स पर बहुत हल्ला हो रहा है । लेकिन जब यह राजप्रमुख बनाये गये थे तब तो सब राजी थे और खुश थे । आज जब हमने उनकी सत्ता ले ली है और वह अपना बचाव नहीं कर सकते तो उनके लिये यह हल्ला किया जा रहा है ।

●
क्या यह हमारे लिए उचित है ? कल किसी ने यह भी कहा कि प्रीवि पर्स को दो साल के लिए सस्पेंड कर दिया जाये । मैं कहती हूँ कि हम अपनी इस पार्लियामेंट को दो साल के लिए सस्पेंड क्यों न कर दें और हम सब फाइव इयर्स प्लान में लग जायें । आपको मालूम है कि जब यह हाउस चलता है तो दस पन्द्रह हजार रुपया रोज का खर्च होता है । अभी दो दिन के लिए जब अपर हाउस बुलाया गया तो आपको मालूम है कि कितना खर्चा हुआ । डेढ़ लाख से ज्यादा खर्चा हुआ है । तो जब हम यह बात दूसरों के लिए कहते हैं तो उसको अपने ऊपर ही क्यों न लागू करें । अगर ऐसा करें तो ज्यादा अच्छा होगा । क्योंकि हम तो दावा करते हैं देश की सेवा करने का । वह लोग तो ऐसा दावा नहीं करते । जिस तरह से राजाओं ने सरकार से कवनेन्ट (covenant) को पालन करने को कहा और हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने इस हाउस के फ्लोर (floor) से यह कहा था कि हम अपने वर्ड (word) को आनर (honour) करेंगे । इसी तरह से जब स्टेटों का फाइनैन्शियल इंटीग्रेशन किया गया उस वक्त जो वर्ड दिया गया था तथा सरकार की तरफ से दस्तखत किए गए थे उसका भी आनर करना चाहिए । अगर हमारी सरकार इस तरह नहीं करेगी तो कोई उसके वर्ड का भरोसा नहीं करेगा । आपकी मुश्किलत हैं यह ठीक है । इसी लिए किसी न किसी तरहसे रास्ता निकालना चाहिए । लेकिन आपने जो वर्ड दिया है उसका पूरा पालन करना चाहिए । एक बात मुझे और कहनी है जिसका जिक्र अभी आखिर के मेम्बर ने किया था । यह आन्ध्र के लोग अजीब हैं । कुछ भी हो सारा दोष सरकार के सिर पर डाला जाता है ।

अगर वह कैपिटल तय कर देती तो यह कहा जाता कि उसने कैपिटल तय कर दिया इससे हमको इतनी मुश्किल हो रही है। आज अगर उन पर छोड़ दिया कि जो चाहो करो, आपस में मिलो और तय करो कि टैम्पोरेरी कैपिटल (temporary capital) कहाँ होनी चाहिए, तो उसका दोष भी सरकार पर रखा जाता है कि सरकार ने यह काम नहीं किया।

मुझे इस समय पर जो बोलने का मौका दिया गया उसके लिए मैं आपका आभार मानती हूँ और मैं ने जो बाउंडरीज के रि-डिस्ट्रिब्यूशन के बारे में कहा उस पर सरकार ठीक तरह से सोचे और तभी इस मामले को उठाये जब इस पर अच्छी तरह से विचार कर लिया जाय।

Shri Punnoose (Alleppey); The hon. Member from Bombay was saying that we on this side do not near though we have ears and do not see though we have eyes. There may be that type of deficiency or disease. But I was wondering whether those gentlemen who say that everything is going on as it ought to be and that we have progressed as we should have, are not suffering from what is called double vision. Well, a great scientist once discovered an elephant in the moon and began to weave a theory about it. But after some time it was found to his disappointment that a rat had crept into his telescope! I would ask the hon. Members of the other side to examine whether the rat has crept into their telescope.

After these five years how are we to settle accounts? Is it enough for hon. Members on the other side of the House to shout that we have prospered? Or is it enough that some of us here also should join that army who sing their praise? There are millions of people in the country who have to decide it. You say that they have done a lot for the Harijans and the Scheduled Castes. But in all respect I would ask the hon. Member from Bombay what has he heard from the mouths of Harijan Members on the other side of the House, on his own side. Throughout yesterday and on many occasions today we have

found a surprising amount of unanimity in the opinions expressed. No matter whether it was a Congress leader from Hyderabad or a Communist Member here or another Member from Assam, from every side you heard three slogans—I know your aversion for slogans—and these were: number one, abolish Rajpramukhs; number two, democratise and establish responsible Government in Part C States; and number three, do away with this bureaucracy (which is but another word for corruption). These three demands have been put forward. Congressmen demand it, the P.S.P. support it, and the Communists are uncompromisingly for it. I ask: for whom are you keeping this Nizam of Hyderabad, these Rajpramukhs of States, and our great friend there in PEPSU, the Maharaja of Patiala? For whom? Congressmen do not want them, the P.S.P. are against them, and the Communists are uncompromisingly against them: Then for whom are you keeping them? That is for Dr. Kailash Nath Katju, for whom we all have respect, to answer. Your own men do not want them. Then why keep them? The fact is that the present India, India in 1953, is really India in 1947 minus the British Rulers. Everything else is there. After all, in the life and experience of the people there is absolutely no difference, while in this House they shout, glory to the Congress Government.

Well take for example the executive. I was very much impressed by the eloquent defence given by that side. I do not minimise your attempts to curb the evils. But this is a disease that cannot be cured piecemeal. Either you cut at the root or you suffer from it. I do understand, officers can be very good servants. But they should be servants. They should not become masters. But that is what is happening. The Ministers' rule is a euphemistic expression. They do not rule, they only reign. In fact, everyone of our Ministers, Ministers of the States and all those people, whom we respect, at the Centre, are being led helplessly and sometimes hopelessly by their Secretaries. They are in the hands of the Secretaries, the Under-Secretaries and the vast army of officers. Some of the police officers in my State, whom sometimes we meet when we are free, have told me during the last few months: "Well, Mr. Punnoose, please do not misunderstand us; we are not against you; when the British were here they ordered us to arrest you and Congressmen and give you blows; we did. When the Congress came; they asked

[Shri Punnoose]

us to arrest you, we arrested you and gave you blows; tomorrow you may come here and when you come and ask us to arrest Congressmen we will arrest them and give them blows." Here is a set of people who are more than Ministers. They say Ministers might come and go but we are here forever responsible to none, responsive to none! As long as this set-up is there, no matter whoever be the able men at the helm like the gentleman who are sitting there now or even men more revolutionary are there, nothing good can come to this country.

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy (Salem): The hon. Member is not addressing the Chair.

Shri Punnoose: I am sure the chairman's eyes are everywhere.

I will come to the institution of Rajpramukhs. Why not we abolish it? What is the moral argument against it? What is the political argument against it? The other day in the Travancore-Cochin State Assembly the Revenue Minister was replying that the Rajpramukh of Travancore-Cochin has got a landed property of 16469 acres. A small area! My friend Mr. Chacko and others are fighting for new lands in Andamans. We are suffering from acute density of population and at the same time the Rajpramukh can own so many acres.

Then what about the dismemberment of Hyderabad and the formation of the Vishala Andhra which we demand what about the Aikya Kerala which we demand? What about the Karnatak which we demand and what about Maharashtra? Your plea that India is going to be dismembered by this is bogus because the number of Linguistic Provinces formed will be one less than the present number. The fact is that you want to display democracy alone while everything below remains as it was before. The same social elements, same social classes are entrenched in power with the result that, while you shout the word democracy, people down below who work and toil, lead a miserable life. If we mean business, let us begin with it. Let us have no Rajpramukhs, let us bring these officers under the control of the people. Whenever an occasion comes, I will be able to state how it can be done, and let linguistic States be formed immediately. With these few words, I conclude.

Mr Chairman: The hon. Minister for Home Affairs and States.

Shri Sivamurthi Swami (Kushtagi): I have to make a statement only for five minutes to represent the dissatisfaction and undesirable feelings of Karnatak people over Bellary District after the Prime Minister's statement regarding Andhra State.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. There are a good many Members anxious to speak. Several of them have not even made their maiden speeches. We are running against time.

Shri Sivamurthi Swami: Only two minutes.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member should not take up this attitude. He begins speaking himself without my calling him.

Dr. Katju: We have had a rather unusual feature inasmuch as two Ministries have been discussed at once but I think it has been a satisfactory procedure because after all, the Ministry of States and the Ministry of Home Affairs deal with the same matter, namely the preservation of tranquillity and the maintenance of law and order in the States and I look forward to the day in a very few years when we will have only one Ministry, the Ministry of Home Affairs, for the whole of India. India is a big home whether you divide it into A, B or C and it ought to be cared for as one big home. So far as the Part B States are concerned, in seven years' time under the Constitution, all the distinction will come to an end. So far as Part C States are concerned, I shall take them up in a minute.

I do not propose to keep the House for a very long time and therefore it may be that I may omit to deal with some of the minor points raised here but I should like to assure hon. Members that I have taken note of every single important point that has been mentioned and I need not say that I shall pay the most earnest attention to all the suggestions made.

I shall deal with the States Ministry first. The House has heard various points, not so much with the welfare of the people of these States. A point was raised about financial integration but a great deal of attention was paid to the institution of Rajpramukhs, the privy purses and private property. Therefore, in a way, the debate became a debate on the ex-Rulers of Indian States. So far as the Rajpramukhs as an institution is concerned the House is aware that we are bound by our pledges and I am rather obliged that

my hon. friend from Hyderabad, Swami Ramananda Tirtha recognised this feature. He also said that he was in no way very eager to proceed hastily but he put it in the right way, namely that he hoped that the Rajpramukhs might be persuaded to agree to a change. That approach, I respectfully suggest, is the proper approach in this case. I am speaking from some experience. Rajpramukhs, as an institution, involve expenditure. It also involves sentimental considerations and psychological approach. My hon. friend Swami Ramananda Tirtha dealt with the sentimental matters. So far as the financial approach was concerned, I think he rightly did not lay stress on it. I have been in Bengal and in Orissa. The Governor appointed by the President is only a constitutional head of the State but under the sanction of the President. You may take it that the Governor is a source of fairly considerable expenditure. He gets a salary, he gets a sumptuary allowance, touring charges and what not and all these come to Rs. two lakhs. As compared to the Governors, I imagine that the Rajpramukhs are getting a lesser sum, may be a lakh here or a lakh there. That does not matter, (*Interruptions*). Sir if I am interrupted, you will have to sit till eight o'clock.

Mr. Chairman: I request hon. Members not to interrupt the hon. Minister. Let him proceed in his own way. After all every hon. Member on this side of the House has also been heard patiently.

Dr. Katju: I quite appreciate the sentimental approach of my hon. friend Swami Ramananda Tirtha. We were in Hyderabad and he gave a bit of history. He said, "How can we possibly deal with our Rajpramukh with whom we have had disagreement before". Now the House will recollect that there are only seven Rajpramukhs and my hon. friend has been quite rightly dealing with one Rajpramukh that he knows. I do not know really what would have been his sentiments if he had been a resident of a neighbouring State whose head is supposed to be an ideal constitutional ruler even before this merger. I only desire that we should resist the tendency to generalise upon individual experiences. In the South there are three Rajpramukhs. There may be differences of opinion about each of them. Similarly, in Northern India, there are four. I do not wish to go into personalities. I do suggest that the right approach is that we must proceed in such a way that we

may not be charged with breaking our solemn promises. That brings me to the other aspect, namely, the privy purse. I have before me an extract from the speech which was made by Sardar Patel in October, 1949 in the Constituent Assembly when the House was discussing article 291 in which there was a constitutional guarantee given about all these Agreements and Privy purses, and what not. I should like to read the last para of Sardar Patel's speech.

"The capacity for mischief and trouble on the part of the Rulers if the settlement with them would not have been reached on a negotiated basis was far greater than could be imagined at this stage. Let us do justice to them; let us place ourselves in their position and then assess the value of their sacrifice. The Rulers have now discharged their part of the obligations by transferring powers and by agreeing to the integration of their States. The main part of our obligation under these Agreements is to ensure that the guarantees....

I wish the House should follow this,—

...that the guarantees given by us in respect of privy purse are fully implemented. Our failure to do so would be a breach of faith and seriously prejudice the stabilisation of the new order."

Shri Punnoose: What about the guarantee to the nation?

Dr. Katju: That was in 1949; we are now in March 1953. The plighted word remains.

Shri Punnoose: The people?

Mr. Chairman: Order, order.

Dr. Katju: The Constituent Assembly was representative of the people. Hon. Members may hold their views. They are a very revolutionary lot. I am sure—I do not know what to say—either the Rulers or Ex-Rulers; many of them will not be, and I will not be, safe when you come into power.

Hon. Members: No, no. (*Interruption*).

Dr. Katju: You may take quite a different view and change. So far as we humble individuals are concerned, we have faith in the word that we give. So far as privy purses are concerned, I should like to mention just one fact. The House remembers that there have

[Dr. Katju]

been privy purses exceeding ten lakhs in many cases, in the case of big Rulers. But, they are only for life.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

Whenever there is a succession, every privy purse will be reduced to ten lakhs. As a matter of fact, there have been some cases. The late Maharaja of Jodhpur died in an air crash. His privy purse has been reduced from twenty-seven lakhs to ten lakhs. There have been other cases by death, recognition, retirement or by historical processes. I was just calculating this morning. At the end of their life, there would be a reduction of about one crore. Sardar Patel mentioned that the total privy purse, when the Constitution was being passed, was somewhere about 5.8 crores. After this adjustment takes place at the end of the first life, that would be reduced to four crores. I quite realise that the times are changing, and public opinion is changing. I am aware more than many hon. Members here are aware, that the Rulers and their families and their sons and grandsons are quite alive to the exigencies of the times.

That approach, I repeat, the approach mentioned by Ramananda Tirtha, namely that they should be persuaded to enter into reasonable arrangements is the best. For us, having given our word, on behalf of the people of India in the solemn Assembly, it would not be fair and we should not be accused of entering into unilateral transactions.

Then, comes the question of private properties. I was rather surprised when I heard all that the hon. Lady Member who just now spoke mentioned. I find that this private property question was settled with extraordinary care. Every time the local Governments and Ministries were consulted, and the proof of that is this. I have been now ten months in charge of this ministry. You may take it from me that not a single State Government has said one word about the private property lists or suggested that they have been ignored or that their views were not consulted or that the private property list is wrong. Some private property lists are still under consideration. It is our practice that our officers go, keep the Ministries and local Governments in the forefront and everything is settled with their consideration. Lastly, I may say that some of the properties in these lists are magnificent palaces and other properties. They are not of much saleable value. They have no market. In these hard days, it is difficult to maintain a palace:

it is difficult to maintain a big house in an unknown place. It may be that many of the Rulers may say, well, we have the satisfaction of having them as part of our private properties. Whosoever is going to live in Dungarpur or Banswara. They may consider handing over these properties to the State Governments for public use, thus earning the admiration and gratitude of their people. Any way, the suggestion that was made in the debate namely that the private property lists have been simply framed and settled in a haphazard fashion, that the people have had no voice, is entirely baseless. This is all about the Ex-Rulers.

Then, a point was raised about financial integration of the backward areas. I come from one of those small States myself. I realise where the shoe pinched and where it did not. My own experience is that in so far as the small States are concerned, speaking very broadly, their economic condition — I again repeat the economic condition of the people was in many ways not so bad as it was in some other parts of India. Of course, conditions differ from State to State. But, where the Ruler was enlightened Ruler where he had a soft heart for the people, where he was accessible to the people, the condition was not so bad. Assessment was very light. Particularly, please remember that the pressure of population in many of these States is not heavy. In Malwa, Madhya Bharat, the density is only about 190 or 180 per square mile as compared with Bengal, U.P. or the eastern districts of the U.P. But, the backwardness consists in other things. Take medical relief. The States, particularly the Union States, were well off because every Ruler big or small had a hospital or a dispensary or something. The backwardness consisted in education. The Rulers were not fond of maintaining schools. Communications were bad; and things of that description. So far as that matter is concerned, the Finance Commission has dealt with it and the Government, at the time of integration entered into a solemn agreement with some of the Unions, Saurashtra, Madhya Bharat, Hyderabad also, where they said they would examine this alleged backwardness and do their best to help them.

And something was said about the Five Year Plan and the Part B States not having their share. It is not quite fair because I have now got the figures from the Planning Commission. I

think they have dealt with the Part B States on a fairly liberal and generous scale. For instance, I find:

BALANCE AVAILABLE FROM REVENUE ACCOUNT:

Contribution from the States—	
Part A States ..	Rs. 130 Crores.
Part B States ..	„ 19 „
Additional Revenues to be raised—	
Part A States ..	Rs. 167 Crores.
Part B States ..	„ 43 „
Loans from the Market—	
Part A States ..	Rs. 72 Crores.
Part B States ..	„ 17 „
Withdrawal from Reserves—	
Part A States ..	Rs. 46 Crores
Part B States ..	„ 22 „

Now, the area is large, and the population also is, I think, one to four. Now, as Minister of States and as a resident of one of these Indian States myself I believe—I am afraid my hon. friend (to call him the Finance Minister) has come to hold the opinion that I am an advocate for these Part B States so far as the Cabinet is concerned; and as a Minister of States, it is my duty to put forward their claims with all the strength that I possibly can, and he has dealt with us fairly in one manner, viz., the Chambal Project has got on to the Plan. When it is completed, it will, we hope...

Shri Radhelhal Vyas (Ujjain): But he has not given a single pie for this year.

Dr. Katju: That is now your job. I have done my job. I am sure he looks very austere, but he has got a very soft heart and a very sympathetic heart. He has done well. He has promised us all possible help, but he has no money in his own pocket. He has got to raise it from other people. Anyway that is the situation.

Now, I come to the Part C States. There, the House has noticed the political climate and rather differed violently. Some hon. Members said: "Nothing doing. This ought to be abolished. They are a drag on India." Another hon. Member who spoke for Delhi said: "What is the good of threatening us with extinction every day? We are out here. Let us work." At the outset, I must say one thing. I have never

been very much impressed by this argument about what is called an economic unit. So far as the Part C States are concerned, the House would recollect that in the United States which have now lasted for nearly 200 years, the State units vary enormously in size. There are 48 States in the Union. At the one end you have New York, about two crores in population, with a city supposed to be the biggest in the world. I think eight million is the population of New York, and wealth fabulous. I do not know really as to what is the revenue of the City of New York, apart from the State of New York. At the other end, there is a small State like Rhodes Island with a population of hardly three lakhs and a half; one State with which I am rather familiar, Vermont, with a population of five lakhs; and the Constitution is that each State, irrespective of its size, sends two Members to the Senate which has got all power over peace and war questions; and so far as the Lower House, the House of Representatives, is concerned, for every six lakhs, you send a representative with a minimum of one to provide for the case of Vermont or Rhodes Island. And the curious thing is that Vermont sends one Member to the House of Representatives, and two to the Senate, and thus they are functioning. But, when I made enquiries there—and that is a matter which I suggest that the protagonists of the Part C States should bear in mind—I found that the smaller States do not try to emulate the bigger States in their Ministerial management, in their administration. The danger is that the Part C States may become top-heavy in administration. I have noticed that tendency, that real danger. I spoke about it in Bhopal; I spoke about it in Ajmer. They say: "Very well. In Uttar Pradesh they have got ten Ministers. Why can't we have at least five? They have got ten Secretaries. Why can't we have at least seven?" There is a Law Secretary, there is a Finance Secretary, there is a Chief Secretary, there is a Public Health Secretary and what not. Then there is the Director of Public Instruction, Director of Public Instruction in Uttar Pradesh with 63 districts, and Director of Public Instruction. Let us say in a small State with a population of five lakhs! So, there is great opportunity, and great desirability there of co-ordinating with the neighbouring States so far as these highly technical appointments are concerned. You may try to utilize the services of the neighbouring Director of Industries, Director of Public Instruction, Registrar of

[Dr. Katju]

Co-operative Societies, Officer-in-charge of Veterinary Services and all that. If every one of these Part C States tries to have an independent officer of its own, they will come to grief, because, in the first place, the officer concerned will not have much to do, and in the second place, the Finance Minister will say: "I am not going to foot the Bill". Therefore, if the administration is not top-heavy, then the smallness of the unit is not a matter of great concern.

I will not take the House very long. I am speaking quite generally. Among the smaller States, we have got Ajmer, Coorg and Delhi. They are independent units because of long historical processes. Ajmer has been considered a separate unit, I believe, from the year 1803. For historical reasons the British Government was treating it separately, and it was continued. Similarly, Coorg. And then, Kutch. Then, we have Vindhya Pradesh and Himachal Pradesh,—good units, and I think, they are good units for administration also provided they take that into consideration. There is some talk going on of having a small Joint Public Services Commission. There is a talk going on about joining the judicial administration with the neighbouring High Courts. I should like to add here that the House may have seen in the newspapers that for the last three or four months I have been having talks with the Chief Ministers of the Part C States in which many questions have been placed for discussion. And we have reached agreed conclusions on every point, and the orders are now under issue and the result will be that the procedure will be very much simplified, and I expect that the part C States Governments will be able to make much progress, better progress.

Now, Manipur and Tripura have been very much talked of, and some hon. Members coming from that part had spoken with zeal. Now, I must say that the picture that they try to paint has absolutely no relation to reality. I have been there myself. I have been at Manipur. I do not see through anybody else's eyes. I try to see through my own eyes in so far as I can. I am not led by officers. I went, mixed with the people. And I had been to Kutch only the other day. Now one factor was not mentioned, viz., both Tripura and Manipur are border States, and they are of the utmost strategic importance to India. Whatever may be the administration, this way or

that way, we cannot possibly take any risks in that State.

Shri Nambiar: What is the risk?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He has said it is a border State.

Dr. Katju: I respectfully submit that the hon. Members try to paint a picture of utter lawlessness. Somebody said it was colonialism. Just consider it. Here is a Member from Tripura sitting in Parliament, taking part in debates, asking questions, and he says: "Indian Imperialism is governing the colonialism of Tripura and Manipur." It is absurd. Can you imagine it? Are you a sort of colony? That shows the tendency that, if any hon. friend gets the chance, he will run away with it.

Shri Rishang Keishing (Outer Manipur—Reserved—Sch. Tribes): What I said was that our position is worse than that of the colonial people. (*Interruptions*).

Dr. Katju: Now, there is talk of democratisation. I sometimes rub my eyes when I hear the phrase. Do you know what is imperialism? If it were there, would you have been sitting here in this Parliament? You have got the privilege of bringing to light, discussing, and raising debates on minute questions, on how many prisoners are there in jail... (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order, let there be no concurrent remarks.

Dr. Katju: This afternoon, an hon. Member raised questions 'What about that particular field, is there water, or is it a dry land...?' and so on. You are bringing here all these points. You are represented here, and these are all elected people, elected Members from different parts of India; and yet, you say there is no democratisation, and there is no popular rule there. (*Interruptions*). I quite realise this.....

An Hon. Member: It is so.

Dr. Katju: I quite realise that there may be no Legislative Assembly there, and I am quite frank. The way in which some gentlemen have behaved, especially some political parties have behaved there, makes us a little suspicious. Considered, people say, is a plant of very slow growth in.....

An Hon. Member: It cuts both ways.

Dr. Katju: What was happening there last year in Manipur and Tripura? I do not want to go into very

controversial ground. This afternoon a question was put, regarding a case in which the accused were acquitted, but 26 persons are still absconding and let my hon. friends, the members of the Communist Party, who know more about those accused than I do, consider where these absconders are.

Sri Biren Dutt (Tripura West): You will never find them out. (*Interruptions.*)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. How can this be allowed? There is some interruption or other, and hon. Members go on interpreting what is said this way or that way. Let the hon. Minister go on now. Other hon. Members have had their own say. So, there is no meaning in laughing, or doing this or that. That does not at all add to the decorum of the House. (*Interruptions.*)

Sri Raghavaiah (Ongole): An allegation is made...

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order.

Dr. Katju: Lastly, there was some mention of Andamans, and I believe some appreciation was expressed of what was being done in the colonisation scheme. We propose to acquire about 20,000 acres of forest land, to settle about 4000 families there, and I think a very large sum, over a crore of rupees has been sanctioned, and families are being sent there. But the work is rather slow that it will take about two or three years to complete the work. Meanwhile, communications there are very difficult. I am trying my very best to improve them. And the Communications Ministry have been very helpful in having an airfield built up there, with good roads properly repaired and improved, and when that airfield comes into existence I am hoping that it may be possible to begin with a weekly service to Andamans. Some hon. Members of this House went there, and were enchanted with that they saw. When the communications improve, both by sea vessel and by air services, I do hope that there is a very prosperous future in front of these islands.

Some Members mentioned about that explosive topic—Abu. Views had been expressed. That matter is always under consideration and something will have to be done about it. Of course, it is a question of time.

Before I pass on from the States Ministry, I might just say one word about the State Counsellors. Now, I know that different views are held. Speaking

for myself, if I had been in any one of these States I would have welcomed the appointment for the simple reason that under the existing rules the State Counsellor is not there to interfere. He is there to offer advice, if asked. But the present situation is this: There is no State Counsellor in Mysore, none in Travancore-Cochin...

Shri Madhao Reddi (Adilabad): Why in Hyderabad?

Dr. Katju: ...and not one in Saurashtra. The appointment is in abeyance in Madhya Bharat. The situation really is this. We are not very keen. If you want one, we will give you one.

Shri Nambiar: We do not want.

Dr. Katju: You do not want.

Shri Nambiar: In Hyderabad we do not want.

Dr. Katju: I know you do not want anybody there. Now, that is the situation. In Hyderabad we have got the Financial Counsellor to assist in the management of the finances.

Now, that brings me to the Home Ministry. I was glad to hear and I am very grateful for what was said about the very welcome feature in the last year, namely, that, but for the lawlessness in some parts of India owing to organised gangs and dacoits, in one particular place owing to some improper functioning of the State Ministry and tardily, owing to these everlasting threats of *Satyagrahis* and disobedience of the laws, strikes and all that—if we eliminate these three—we can easily congratulate ourselves on the tranquil conditions that have prevailed in this great land of ours. We are 36 crores. The whole world is in a very disturbed condition, and we are not behind any 'Iron curtain'. I think the liberty that this country enjoys in freedom of expression and freedom of public meeting is enviable.

Shri Algu Rai Shastri (Azamgarh Distt.—Eas' cum Ballia Distt.—West): Rather too much.

Dr. Kaiju: Then the Press. A wonderful Press we have got. They are free, they are open. We have only to read the Urdu Press, the Hindi Press and even the English sheets as to what they say about us. And yet peace prevails and that is, I suggest, possibly the greatest tribute that one can pay to the general good sense of the community at large. All sorts of things are said before the people in the villages—a

[Dr. Katju]

new heaven, a new earth, a new Jerusalem, the poorer people who are passing through troubles and hard times are told by my hon. friends here, there—everywhere—all sorts of things, but still they hold fast to their moorings and they are not carried away.

Now, I should like to say something here about these constant threats of strikes. It is a very painful feature. It is getting late. It is a very harmful thing. What was permissible, I suggest to you, when we were being ruled by foreigners is not permissible today.

Shri Nambiar: Why?

Dr. Katju: Here is a Government to which you are a party. You are talking everyday of democratisation and of democratic Government, and the first rule of a democratic Government is the rule of the majority. (Interruptions). If you do not accept it, if you say that you are entitled to break any law that is passed by this House or by the State Legislatures, if anybody says like that, he is entitled to break it. I can understand a man saying: 'Well, I am going on fast'. He goes on fast in a decent manner and in his own house. Let him do it. But he starts it in a place like Chandni Chowk or in front of the U.P. Assembly on a piece of land. People go and want to break the law. Very well, let them break the law. They start a procession and what do they do? They do not simply rely upon the help of the living; they also seek the aid of the dead. Here are living men—men and women—going in procession and here are the dead ashes—I do not know whether they are genuine or spurious. They go in a procession. Ashes of people who died two months or three months ago, and they are carried! Take the Delhi example. It was announced that the ashes of an old man who died about two months ago would be brought. I do not know what was in that earthen jar.

Ch. Ranbir Singh (Rohtak): He may not have died at all.

Dr. Katju: It was advertised that they would come at half past five at Railway station; people should go and assemble there and then they were going to be exposed. After sunset, when the streets were congested they would be taken in procession through Chandni Chowk and other congested parts and then they will be consigned to the Jumna. That was what was said. Probably they would have been kept in that earthen

jar, if they were there at all, and they would have been used elsewhere on another occasion. Is that the proper thing. If we put these aside, I think we have passed through a fairly peaceful period.

Shri Algu Rai Shastri: Why is all that allowed?

Dr. Katju: There is a good deal of talk about restriction of liberties and preventive detention. One hon. friend very generously said that he will say something about it when the resolution comes. I will wait and see. The lady Member, who is not here, Mrs. Renu Chakravartty spoke about the Kalkdwip prisoners. Please remember that law and order is the primary responsibility of the State Government. I have asked for information and what I find is that their case was started two or three years ago. Then the Supreme Court came in and said that the West Bengal Act for the trial of these cases setting up independent Tribunals was *ultra vires*. That was in 1951. Then the West Bengal Government had to pass another Act and the result is that the trials have now been going on and the accused are undergoing trial.

So far as the detenus under the Preventive Detention Act are concerned, the latest information is that the number of detenus is six in the whole of West Bengal. Now, I do not want to go into that. The House may take it from me that the State Governments—I do not claim any credit for myself—have exercised the utmost scrupulous care that unnecessary action should not be taken under the Preventive Detention Act. But I do think that contingencies may arise when a situation may demand—it is demanding today—that action should be taken so that the mischief may be nipped in the bud.

Shri Nand Lal Sharma (Sikar): What is the number in Delhi?

Dr. Katju: A good deal of talk took place about the salaries, high and low salaries. Of course, we have a very favourite proposition, namely the floor and the ceiling. That the highest salary should not exceed the lowest salary by ten times. Somebody said that if the minimum salary is Rs. 100 the highest salary should not exceed Rs. 1000. I was rather disposed to agree with this proposition with a small difference, namely, I think you should divide the different wage-earners or salary earners into age groups. If you start with group of 20 to 25—you employ a sweeper, you give him I think Rs. 80

today. You employ a postman on Rs. 80, you employ a clerk in the Secretariat. I was told that he would get Rs. 105 as basic pay. You employ at that very age group a Munsif, a Doctor, a member of the Provincial Medical Service, or an Engineer or a member of the Indian Administrative Service or the Provincial Service. What do you pay? The Doctor gets Rs. 250, the Munsif gets Rs. 250, and Engineers and technicians all those people who have qualified, poor fellows who have read for ten years and fifteen years in colleges. You take advantage of them. You compare the salaries of that age group. What you do is to compare the salary in the lowest group, the salary in the lowest group of 20 to 25 men who start their lives, with the salary of the topmost man at the age of 50 to 55 and you say that he gets Rs. 3,000. I am not talking about the Rs. 4,000/- people.

Shri K. K. Basu (Diamond Harbour): May I know what the sweeper at the age of 55 gets?

Dr. Katju: I am coming to that. The Finance Minister is there, in any case, to reply to it.

Shri Chattopadhyaya (Vijayavada): Do not be an escapist.

Dr. Katju: Please hear me. A man in the 20 to 25 age group who starts on Rs. 80 or Rs. 100 gets responsibilities, gets experience, gets children. He has to marry and educate his children. He must be getting something extra. What does he get? I enquired about clerks. If a man is unfit, he goes away. He is turned out. If he is normal, average, then he may get a basic salary of Rs. 150. He starts on Rs. 75 and goes up to Rs. 150, or with D.A. to Rs. 200. Similarly, a Munsif who starts on Rs. 250 goes up to Rs. 1,000. An I.A.S.—and he is the black beast of the day—starts on Rs. 350—I am talking of the average man—and goes up to Rs. 1,800. If you say that Rs. 1,800 down to Rs. 150 is within your ten year time limit, then you should remember that you are thinking of a responsible man, a man who has brains and goes to high posts. I suggest for your consideration that it is extremely unfair to take the ceiling of the lowest age group and compare it with the highest age group.

Then, there is another matter. Because the House is interested in this, I shall mention it. I once had a talk with a young lady. Do not laugh. She is a relation of mine. You know the father very well. So, do not laugh. It is very indecent. She is

the wife of an engineer. We were talking about salaries. She said: "If you give me a rent-free house (that costs about Rs. 50); if you undertake to educate my children and give them free education right to the doctor's stage, or engineer's stage or the lawyer's stage; if you give me free medical relief, you may give me any salary you like." So, when you talk of reduction of salaries, please remember that most of us come from middle classes. We have to educate our children. The nation wants doctors. It wants technicians. It wants engineers. It does not want lawyers. But it wants servicemen. If you have to educate at your expense, let us say up to the doctor's stage, then according to a doctor whom I consulted this morning and whom I asked, "What did it cost your father to educate you and make you fit to function as a doctor?", the cost is Rs. 30,000. Medical books are being sold for Rs. 40 or 30 each. The fees are mounting up. If you want to go by that sense of social justice, then the nation should take the responsibility for giving free education to everybody.....(Members from the Opposition: Hear hear).....absolutely free education. But you are demanding from the middle classes today that they should shoulder the burden and they should educate their sons as doctors, technicians etc. and make them available for the service of the nation. That is an aspect which should be considered. I should like to ask Members of the Communist Party—they take part in the debates—and tell them that we shall be very grateful if they will give us the latest information and the most accurate one regarding the salaries in Russia....

Shri Nambiar: Oh, yes. From the Soviet Embassy you can get it.

Dr. Katju:because I am told that the monthly salary for a maid is 300 roubles and the highest salary is nine thousand roubles, and technicians and authors etc.....

Shri Chattopadhyaya: But 300 roubles is a wrong figure.

Shri Algu Rai Shastri: What is the right figure?

Shri Chattopadhyaya: I will tell you. Even the old woman who sweeps the floor receives a salary of 600 roubles.

Dr. Katju: That is all right. A sweeper here also gets Rs. 88. So, what is the good of talking in that way? I want to ask another question. This 600 roubles is the floor. What is the ceiling?

Shri Chattopadhyaya: You mean the average?

7 P.M.

Dr. Katju: No, the ceiling. I am told it is nine thousand roubles, ten thousand roubles and sometimes even sixty thousand roubles. Anyway, my hon. friends will give us the information. Then there is another matter on which I should like to take a minute. One hon. Member, Shri-mati Renu Chakravarty spoke about trade unions and all that. That is very nice. I can understand the right to form trade unions and the right to strike.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I suppose we have spent fifteen minutes over the Bill earlier in the day. I will, therefore apply the guillotine at 7.15 instead of 7.

Dr. Katju: So far as the trade unions are concerned, you have the capital on the one side, the management, the millowners, you have the labour on the other. The State is there as the arbiter to see that there is fairplay and to mediate and settle disputes. So far as the Government and its employees are concerned—my hon. colleague the Deputy Minister has already dealt with the big question—we are not actuated by any profit motives. The capitalist is actuated by profit motives; we are not. We are representing the whole people. So, bringing that analogy into consideration is not very useful.

I wanted to say just one or two words about the administration of justice and then I would have finished.

Shri K. K. Basu: There is no justice to be administered.

Dr. Katju: My hon. friend says there is no justice to be administered. If there is no justice he would not have been here. But the general complaint is that justice is dilatory, is expensive and what not. It is a very familiar complaint. But I should like to place before the House one recent piece of news which has appeared in the newspapers, and which I am sure will please the House as a whole. I plead strongly for the association of the people in the administration of justice. Most of the troubles from which we are suffering is due to the fact that people do not think that the law courts are their law courts, that the police station is their police station. They think it is something foreign and that they are under no compulsion to render any assistance, to go and give true evidence. Now what I want to bring to the notice of the House is that in Uttar Pradesh,

they have established what is called judicial *panchayats*. The law was passed in 1948 and it took some time to start the machinery and hold elections. Under the elected system these *panchayats* have been functioning for the last two years. I have collected figures for the last nine months and you would be astonished to hear, as I was, the number of petty cases, judicial and criminal, decided by them. For the nine months ending 31st of December 1952, the cases which were disposed of by these *panchayats* were 2,30,000. Now many of them were cases, which were settled by compromise; but even then the figures are astonishing. 94 per cent. of the decisions were accepted—no appeal, no revision, nothing. Revisions were filed on very large and general grounds in six per cent. cases. They were successful only in two per cent. In four per cent. of the cases the magistrates and the civil officers said it was quite all right. Please see the result. Out of 2,30,000 cases 98 per cent. judgments stood. They were decided by these *panchayats* whose members were not educated, but people living in the villages. There was no question of hide-bound rules of evidence or hide-bound procedure. Lawyers were not there to assist them and they did the whole thing. That is proof positive that if you associate people and if the people begin to think that they are administering justice themselves, then it succeeds. I do hope that this will appeal to all parts of India and it is a matter for great gratification that the example set by the Uttar Pradesh has already been followed by many provinces. I do hope that else where also this will prove successful.

Finally, there was something said about passports. Now, passport is not something like a matter of fundamental right. That was wrongly put. Every Government is entitled to see which are the persons who go out. And I shall be quite frank about it. What I want is that there should be complete sincerity about this matter, complete frankness about this matter. If you want to go for any purpose, say, somebody is ill, you can go and have the treatment. But if you can go for treatment, suppose one is suffering from appendicitis,—the sea voyage or the air journey gets you rid of the appendicitis and brings complete health,—and then you go to a Peace Conference in Vienna or Timbuctoo or Brisbane and wander about the whole world, then I say it is not frankness. (An Hon. Member: And the Coronation). We do not want people to go out to bring the Government into contempt. (Interruption).

We do not want people to go out and sabotage the Government here.

Several Hon. Members: No.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta—North East): Be free and frank.

Dr. Katju: That is all that I have to say. But before I sit down I would like to answer to an appeal which was made to me by two Members. Both of them have gone away and therefore it is really not necessary. I was asked to express regret for something which has happened in Delhi. What I wanted to say was if I had the least consciousness of having done something improper myself I would have been the first person to express regret.

Shri Chattopadhyaya: You could never be capable of doing it.

Shri Algu Rai Shastri: Because he never does wrong.

Dr. Katju: I am always careful about it. Some hon. Member read out an editorial from the Hindu that 'the Home Minister should have expressed regret'. What for? What have I done? People go and they are alleged to be arrested by a Magistrate. That is a matter for trial. If they are arrested by a Magistrate it seems to be quite all right. The Supreme Court did not go into that matter. It went into another matter. As I said the other day, picture to yourself. Lawyers are there, eminent barristers, vakils, distinguished accused, both lawyers, barristers, etc., and the Magistrate is there, and the trial takes place in jail. Everybody knows where they have come from, where they are going back. And they say, 'Please adjourn the case'. If they had said to the Magistrate, 'We want to go out', the Magistrate would have said, 'Go out'. They did not want to. And the Magistrate forgot to write the three words. I gather from the newspapers that a distinguished friend of mine, one of the persons concerned, had actually offered to go to jail, himself. He did not want to remain out. That is what the newspapers said. What am I to express regret for? If I begin to express regret on everything, good, bad or indifferent, then my regret would become valueless. I should express regret when there is something genuine behind it and it carries some sense.

I would ask the House to pass these Demands with acclamation.

Shri Sarangadhar Das: My question has not been answered, about the 30 PSD

Mercantile Corporation four months after.....

Dr. Katju: That case is under consideration.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I shall first put all the cut motions on the Demands for the Ministry of Home Affairs to the vote of the House.

The cut motions were negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the respective sums not exceeding the amounts shown in the third column of the Order Paper in respect of Demands Nos. 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58 and 127 be granted to the President to complete the sums necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1954 in respect of the corresponding heads of Demands entered in the second column thereof."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now, I shall put all the cut motions on the Demands for the Ministry of States to the vote of the House.

The cut motions were negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the respective sums not exceeding the amounts shown in the third column of the Order Paper in respect of Demands Nos. 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95 and 135 be granted to the President to complete the sums necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1954, in respect of the corresponding heads of Demands entered in the second column thereof."

The motion was adopted.

[The motions for Demands for Grants which were adopted by the House are reproduced below.—Ed. of P. P.]

DEMAND No. 52—MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,17,43,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1954, in respect of 'Ministry of Home Affairs'."

DEMAND No. 53—CABINET

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 21,88,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1954, in respect of 'Cabinet'."

DEMAND No. 54—DELHI

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,38,58,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1954, in respect of 'Delhi'."

DEMAND No. 55—POLICE

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 63,37,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1954, in respect of 'Police'."

DEMAND No. 56—CENSUS

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 9,62,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1954, in respect of 'Census'."

DEMAND No. 57—MISCELLANEOUS DEPARTMENTS AND EXPENDITURE UNDER THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 10,15,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1954, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Departments and Expenditure under the Ministry of Home Affairs'."

DEMAND No. 58—ANDAMAN AND NICOBAR ISLANDS

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,61,29,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1954, in respect of 'Andaman and Nicobar Islands'."

DEMAND No 127—CAPITAL OUTLAY OF THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 26,28,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1954, in respect of 'Capital Outlay of the Ministry of Home Affairs'."

DEMAND No. 88—MINISTRY OF STATES

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 10,63,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1954, in respect of 'Ministry of States'."

DEMAND No. 89—PRIVY PURSES AND ALLOWANCES OF INDIAN RULERS

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,92,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1954, in respect of 'Privy Purses and Allowances of Indian Rulers'."

DEMAND No. 90—KUTCH

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,01,83,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1954, in respect of 'Kutch'."

DEMAND No. 91—BILASPUR

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 23,43,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1954, in respect of 'Bilaspur'."

DEMAND No. 92—MANIPUR

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 58,19,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1954, in respect of 'Manipur'."

DEMAND No. 93—TRIPURA

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,11,22,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1954, in respect of 'Tripura'."

DEMAND No. 94—RELATIONS WITH STATES

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 56,95,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1954, in respect of 'Relations with States'."

DEMAND No. 95—MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE UNDER THE MINISTRY OF STATES

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 54,66,000 be granted to the Presi-

dent to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1954, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Expenditure under the Ministry of States'."

DEMAND No. 135—CAPITAL OUTLAY OF THE MINISTRY OF STATES

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,67,35,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1954, in respect of 'Capital Outlay of the Ministry of States'."

The House then adjourned till Two of the Clock on Wednesday, the 1st April, 1953.

